REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection

This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Boston Public Library

https://archive.org/details/worldbeforeabrah00mitc_0

Hinckley Gilbert Mitchell

THE WORLD BEFORE ABRAHAM, According to Genesis I.–XI. With an Introduction to the Pentateuch. Large crown 8vo, $1.75, *net*.

AMOS: An Essay in Exegesis. Large crown 8vo, $1.50.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,
BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

THE WORLD BEFORE ABRAHAM

ACCORDING TO GENESIS I.–XI.

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH

BY

H. G. MITCHELL

Professor in Boston University

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
1901

COPYRIGHT, 1901, BY H. G. MITCHELL

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published October, 1901

PREFACE

In a recent issue of a popular religious weekly appeared the following : —

"Kindly give the name of some book on Genesis which treats it from the view-point of modern scholarship."

This item indicates a demand for commentaries on Genesis written in the light of the results of the most recent researches into its age and structure. The demand is really widespread, as any one in my position can testify ; but thus far little has been done in England or America to meet it. The editor to whom the above appeal was made, therefore, recommended a translation of Dillmann's work, which, though very valuable to those who are prepared to appreciate it, is too large, too learned, and too expensive for most students of the Bible. This state of things ought not to continue. A desire to do what I can to remedy it is my excuse for putting into print the following pages.

The first part of my book is devoted to the Pentateuchal question, which I have tried to discuss with perfect candor, and settle, for myself as well as my reader, in accordance with the evidence in the case. In the comments of the second part my object has been simply to interpret the text of the first eleven chapters of Genesis in the light of the theory adopted. The ideas thus

presented are therefore not mine, but those which in a given case the author seemed to me to have intended to convey. If I have missed his meaning, I will cheerfully acknowledge my error and make any necessary corrections.

There are doubtless those who, at first, will feel that some of my results threaten their faith in the Scriptures. I can assure them that their anxiety is groundless, as they will discover, if they will consider: (*1*) that the essential element in these chapters is not the things narrated, but, as I have more than once elsewhere intimated, the religious ideas underlying them; and (*2*) that these ideas derive much of their importance to us from the fact that they represent stages more or less remote in the process by which God prepared his people, and through them the world, for the supreme revelation of himself in the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth.

A few words with reference to some of the details of my method.

In the matter of proper names it at first seemed to me best to follow the English Version; but, at the risk of being thought pedantic, I finally decided in the translation and the comments to give them forms that would represent their original pronunciation as nearly as possible with English characters. The scheme adopted is that most in vogue among Semitic scholars. Those who are not acquainted with it will note: that ' represents a letter practically silent, and ' one whose pronunciation resembles that of a forcible *ʳǵ*; that *ḥ*, *ṭ*, and *ṣ* (with dots under them) should also be strongly articulated; that the

pronunciation of *s* does not differ from that of *s;* and that *bh, dh, ph,* and *th* have the sounds of *v, th* in *this, f,* and *th* in *thin,* respectively, while the *h* in *gh* and *kh* calls for a slight aspiration of the preceding letter.

The reader should observe that, in this, as in my previous books, where other authors are cited I use *see* and *compare* in different senses. Thus *See Dillmann* is intended to indicate that this author favors the view expressed, but *Comp. Dillmann,* that he holds a different opinion.

In grammatical matters I should have been glad to make use of the last English edition of Kautzsch's *Gesenius;* but, since the book is beyond the means of most students, I felt obliged to cite the second American edition, although it is a very faulty translation.

I have undertaken in this volume to discuss only eleven chapters. I may later finish the book of Genesis, unless some one better qualified for the work anticipates me. Meanwhile those who wish to continue their studies in this direction will find help especially in the commentaries of Dillmann and Delitzsch, and such works as Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* and Bacon's *Genesis of Genesis* or the Oxford *Hexateuch.* Those who read German should also consult the commentaries of Holzinger and Gunkel.*

* The introduction to Gunkel's book has recently appeared in English.

CONTENTS

THE PENTATEUCH 1
Names and Divisions 1
Traditional Authorship 4
Structure and Composition 16
Age of Documents and Order of Compilation . . . 36
ANALYSIS OF GEN. I.–XI. 68
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTS 73
Translation 73
Comments 95
APPENDIX 281
INDEXES 289

THE WORLD BEFORE ABRAHAM

THE PENTATEUCH

I. Names and Divisions

The Pentateuch corresponds to the first of the three parts into which the Jews divide their Scriptures. Its Hebrew title is *Law.** In the later books of the Old Testament it is called, *The Book of the Law of Yahweh* (2 Chr. xvii. 9), *The Book of the Law of God* (Neh. viii. 18), *The Book of the Law of Moses* (Neh. viii. 1), *The Book of the Law* (2 Chr. xxxiv. 15), *The Book of Moses* (2 Chr. xxv. 4 ; comp. 2 Kgs. xiv. 6), *The Law of Yahweh* (2 Chr. xxxi. 3), *The Law of God* (Neh. x. 29/28), *The Law of Moses* (2 Chr. xxiii. 18), and finally, as above, *The Law* (2 Chr. xxxiv. 19).† The names given to it in the New Testament are, *The Book of the Law* (Gal. iii. 10), *The Book of Moses* (Mar. xii. 26), *The Law of the Lord, i. e.*, Yahweh (Lu. ii. 23), *The Law of Moses*

* תורה. The title of the other two parts respectively are: נביאים, *Prophets*, for Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets; and כתובים, *Writings*, for Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles.

† The later books only are cited because, as will be shown in the proper connection, the "law" to which they refer probably is, while that referred to in the earlier books certainly is not, the Pentateuch.

(Lu. ii. 22), *The Law* (Mat. xii. 5), and *Moses* (Lu. xvi. 29). The modern Hebrew, or, strictly speaking, the Aramaic, names are, *The Five Fifths of the Law*, *The Fifths of the Book of the Law*, *The Five Fifths*, and *The Fifths*.* The name *Pentateuch*, from the Greek, means five-volume,† and is therefore substantially the equivalent of these Aramaic designations.

The five fifths of which the Pentateuch is composed are designated in Hebrew by one or more of the words with which they respectively begin. Thus, the first has for its title the equivalent of *In the beginning*; ‡ the second, of *These are the names*,§ or simply *Names*; ‖ the third, of *And called*; ¶ the fourth, of *And said*,** or, *In the desert*; †† and the fifth, of *These are the words*, ‡‡ or, *Words*. §§ The Jews also called these books by names indicating their order or their contents. Thus, the second is sometimes designated as *The second fifth*; the third, as *The law of the priests*, or, *The book of the priests*; the fourth, as *The fifth of numbers*; and the fifth, after Deu. xvii. 18, as *The copy of the law*.‖‖ The English names are derived from the Greek; but, except

* Fürst, *KAT*, 6.

† The original, πεντάτευχος, is properly an adjective modifying βίβλος understood; hence it is feminine, rarely masculine. See also the Latin *Pentateuchus* and *Pentateuchum*.

‡ בראשית. § אלה שמות. ‖ שמות.
¶ ויקרא. ** וידבר. †† במדבר.
‡‡ אלה הדברים.

§§ דברים. The same means are employed by the Jews to designate smaller divisions of the Pentateuch. Thus, the third lesson in Genesis (xii.–xviii.) is referred to as *Get thee* (לך לך), because these words occur in xii. 1. See also Mar. xii. 26. The Babylonians and Assyrians used the same method in naming their books. See Boscawen, *BM*, 40.

‖‖ Fürst, *KAT*, 5 f.

in the case of that of Exodus, they may easily be traced to Hebrew equivalents.

It has become the fashion among Old Testament scholars to follow the lead of Bleek in connecting with the first five books the sixth, thus making the first division of the Hebrew canon a hexateuch. The reasons given are, that the book of Joshua shares the literary peculiarities of those preceding, but especially that they are incomplete without it.* These reasons, however, are not conclusive. In the first place, if, as some of the critics claim,† the great work beginning with Genesis included not only Joshua, but Judges, Samuel, and Kings, a hexateuch is as little warranted by literary characteristics as a pentateuch. Secondly, the completeness or incompleteness of the Pentateuch is a matter of standpoint; for, as Bleek himself says,‡ although, as a historical work, it requires to be supplemented by Joshua, as a Mosaic law-book it has in Deuteronomy an entirely appropriate conclusion. That the Jews emphasized the legal rather than the historical aspect of these books is indicated by the name that they gave to them. In this aspect they were justified in treating them as a separate division of their Scriptures, and the modern scholar, although he admits their literary and historical relation to the book or books that follow, may imitate their example.

The book of Joshua may be treated apart from those composing the Pentateuch, but the latter cannot be regarded as distinct entities. They are all closely related parts of a whole which would be marred if either of them

* Driver, *ILOT*, 103; Holzinger, *EH*, 4.

† Budde, *RS*, 268 f.; Moore, *Jud.*, xxv. ff.; comp. Cornill, *EAT*, 93 f.; Kittel, *HH*, ii. 14 ff.; Wildeboer, *LOV*, 168 ff.

‡ *EAT*, 125 (Eng. i. 343).

were wanting. To this whole, Genesis may be considered an introduction, and Deuteronomy a conclusion. The so-called middle books, — Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, — which are more intimately related to one another than either of the others to them, constitute the body of the work. These facts, whatever may be the explanation of them, require that the Pentateuch be regarded as an isagogical unit, and it will be so treated in the discussion that is to follow.

II. Traditional Authorship

There are parts of the Hebrew Scriptures to which the names of their real or supposed authors are attached. This is the case with the prophetical, and some of the other books.* The English reader might be led to suppose that the books of the Pentateuch belong to this class, since in the Revised, as well as in the Authorized, Version each of them is provided with a title in which it is distinctly attributed to Moses.† This, however, is not the fact. The Hebrew title in each case is the bare name, and this is an addition to the original not found in manuscripts. If, therefore, Moses wrote the Pentateuch, neither he nor any other for him took the usual method of securing credit for his work: in other words, the Pentateuch, like all the rest of the historical books, except Nehemiah, is an anonymous production.

What does the Pentateuch itself say with reference to its authorship? All agree that there is nothing in Genesis on the subject; but it has been asserted that the middle books claim to have been written by Moses.‡

* See Jeremiah, Proverbs, Nehemiah, etc.

† That of the first, *e. g.*, reads, *The first book of Moses, commonly called Genesis.*

‡ Keil, *EAT*, 165; Harman, *IHS*, 117 ff.; Green, *HCP*, 36 ff.

The passages quoted in support of this opinion, however, when closely examined, will be found to have less force than is attributed to them. When, *e. g.*, as is so often the case, especially in Leviticus and Numbers,* Yahweh is said to have spoken to Moses and communicated to him this or that law, such a statement is not proof that Moses himself put into writing even the law in question, much less that he was the author of the entire work in which it has been preserved. There is nothing in the language used forbidding the supposition that laws thus introduced were transmitted orally for centuries and finally incorporated into the Pentateuch by an exilic compiler. There is not much more force in the passages in which Moses is represented as having actually committed certain things to writing. He doubtless made a record of the attack of Amalek upon Israel and the sentence pronounced upon them in consequence, although the command to do so alone appears in the history of the Exodus (Ex. xvii. 14).† He is expressly said to have written "all the words of Yahweh" on the occasion of the covenant at Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 4), and a similar statement is made with reference to the stations at which the Hebrews halted on their march from Egypt to Canaan (Num. xxxiii. 2). The meaning of Ex. xxxiv. 28 is doubtful, but there can be no doubt that the preceding verse warrants one in supposing that, according to the author, the terms of Yahweh's covenant, just recited (14–26), were preserved

* See Lev. i. 1; iv. 1, etc.

† The original has the definite article before the word for "book"; but this fact does not warrant one in insisting that the book in question was one in which Moses was accustomed to record whatever took place, for in Num. v. 23 the same expression is used of a book provided for a specific occasion. See Ges. § 126, 4, R; comp. Green, *HCP*, 38.

in writing by the law-giver.* One can, however, grant all that these passages assert or imply and still consistently reject the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; since they require one to believe only that four or five chapters of Exodus and Numbers reproduce with more or less accuracy documents from the hand of Moses. If they indicate anything with reference to the whole of which they now form a part, it is that the work was compiled from various sources by some other writer. This is also the natural inference from the use of the third person wherever Moses appears in the narrative, and the irresistible impression produced by the praise bestowed upon him. See Ex. xi. 3; Num. xii. 3. Thus far, therefore, the evidence seems to be in favor of Hobbes' averment,† that the Pentateuch is a book about, rather than by, the hero of the Exodus.

There are statements in Deuteronomy which are interpreted as teaching that Moses wrote, not only this book, but the whole of the Pentateuch. Among them are xxxi. 9 and 24–26. The former says "Moses wrote this law and delivered it to the priests, the sons of Levi, who bore the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, and to the

* The natural subject of the verb *wrote* in *v.* 28 is Moses; but the fact that the words written are described as "the ten words" seems to indicate that the author had in mind the decalogue of chapter xx. and its inscription on stone by Yahweh himself. See xxxi. 18; xxxii. 16. The difficulty is resolved by supposing that the original author of the chapter intended to represent the words of the covenant in *vv.* 14–26 as engraved by Moses on tables prepared for the purpose, and that the present ambiguity of the text was produced by the addition of the phrase "the ten words" to *v.* 28 to bring this passage into harmony with preceding statements to the effect that it was the words thundered from Sinai which were inscribed on these tables. See Bacon, *TTE*, 158.

† *Leviathan*, xxxiii.

elders;" the latter, "It came to pass when Moses had finished writing the words of this law in a book until they were completed, that Moses commanded the Levites who bore the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, saying, Take this book of the law and place it at the side of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh your God, that it may be there as a witness against thee."* The weight of these passages, of course, depends upon the meaning of the phrases "this law" and "this book of the law." They are both of comparatively frequent occurrence in Deuteronomy;† hence, if they are used with anything like uniformity, it ought to be possible to discover their import. Now, the meaning of "this law" is clear enough in the first case in which it is used, but in iv. 8 it is absolutely unmistakable. Moses there describes the law that he has in mind as "this law which I set before you this day," *i. e.* the code which he is on the point of promulgating. But "the law which Moses set before the children of Israel," according to iv. 44, commences with v. 1, although "the statutes and judgments" are first introduced by xii. 1; and (according to xxviii. 69/xxix. 1), concludes with the twenty-eighth chapter. This is the law to which external or internal reference is made throughout Deuteronomy. "This book of the law," therefore, must be the copy of this legislation deposited with the ark of the covenant. In addition to this "book" Moses is said (xxxi. 22) to have left in writing the

* Keil (*IOT*, i. 160) claims that in these passages the composition of the entire law, *i. e.* the Pentateuch, is so clearly attributed to Moses that this doctrine must prevail. See also Green, *HCP*, 37; Harman, *IHS*, 119.

† "This law" occurs i. 5; iv. 8 (44, "this is the law"); xvii. 18, 19; xxvii. 3, 8, 26; xxviii. 58; xxix. 28/29; xxxi. 9, 11, 12, 24; xxxii. 46: "this book of the law," xxix. 20/21; xxx, 10; xxxi. 26. The latter in xxviii. 61 becomes "the book of this law."

"song" that he was inspired to sing just before he was taken from his people. These two writings are all that Deuteronomy ascribes to him. There remain several discourses concerning which it is stated only that he delivered them. Moreover there are fifty-one verses and parts of sixteen others, which, being purely editorial, could hardly be attributed to the lawgiver. In the case of Deuteronomy, therefore, as in that of the three preceding books, the internal evidence warrants one in affirming, at the most, only that the author of it, whoever he was, incorporated into his work documents, independent, be it observed, of those in Exodus and Numbers, which he believed to be of Mosaic origin.

The testimony of the books called by the Jews "Former Prophets," Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, agrees with that of Deuteronomy. Joshua refers to a law given by Moses,* and by him put into the form of a book for the benefit of Israel.† Still, there is no reason to suppose that this book was the Pentateuch, for all the references to it are in Deuteronomic language, and viii. 30 ff., where the ceremony at Ebal is described, proves conclusively that it contained only "the law" of Deuteronomy.‡ The only passage in Judges bearing on the question at issue (iii. 4) refers to commandments given by Yahweh "through Moses," but neglects to inform the reader whether they were oral or written.§

* i. 7; xxii. 5. † i. 8; viii. 31 f., 34; xxiii. 6.

‡ See Deu. xxvii. 2 ff. Jos. xxiv. 26 cannot be cited against this conclusion; for if, as is doubtless the case, "the book of the law of God" there mentioned was not the kernel of Deuteronomy, there is as little reason for believing it to have been the Pentateuch; and, whatever it was, it is not attributed to Moses.

§ The English version has "by the hand of Moses," which is literal but misleading; since, as appears from Ex. ix. 35, the Hebrew expression thus translated simply denotes agency.

The phraseology used, however, makes it evident that, as in Joshua, the Deuteronomic law was in the mind of the writer. In the books of Samuel there are no references to Moses as a lawgiver,* but in the books of Kings there are several. All of them, like those that have preceded, point to Deuteronomy as the law that their author (or authors) had in view. This is clearly enough the case in 1 Kgs. viii. 53 and 56 and 2 Kgs. xviii. 6 and 12; but more so in 1 Kgs. ii. 3 and 2 Kgs. xxi. 8.† In 2 Kgs. xiv. 6, Deu. xxiv. 16 is quoted as a statute from "the book of the law of Moses." Finally, the book found by Hilkiah the priest, and called "the law of Moses" (2 Kgs. xxiii. 25), betrays its identity with some form of Deuteronomy, not only in the names given to it, but by its influence on the language of the historian, and especially on the policy of King Josiah.‡

* The only passage that one would be tempted to quote in this connection is 1 Sam. x. 25; but here, as in Ex. xvii. 14, to write in a, literally *the*, book means neither more nor less than to put into writing.

† On 1 Kgs. viii. 53, see Deu. iv. 19 f.; on *v.* 56, Deu. xii. 9; on 2 Kgs. xviii. 6, Deu. xiii. 5/4; on *v.* 12, Deu. xxix. 24/25; on 1 Kgs. ii. 3, Deu. x. 12 f., xi. 1, and xxix. 8/9; and on 2 Kgs. xxi. 8, Deu. xxviii, 1, etc.

‡ The book is also called "the book of the covenant" (2 Kgs. xxiii. 2, 21), like Deuteronomy (xxviii. 69/xxix. 1). The account of it contains various other Deuteronomic expressions: *e. g.*, "hearken . . . to do," xxii. 13 (Deu. xv. 5; xxviii. 1, 15); "other gods," xxii. 17 (Deu. xiii. 3/2; xxviii. 14, etc.); "commands, testimonies, and statutes," xxiii. 3 (Deu. vi. 17); "with all the heart," etc., xxiii. 3, 25 (Deu. iv. 29; vi. 5; etc.). Finally, the effects produced by the book were such as Deuteronomy would naturally produce. It filled Josiah with terror and anxiety (2 Kgs. xxii. 11), as one would expect Deuteronomy, especially chapter xxviii., to do under the circumstances. It furnished the program for a reform such as would be required by Deuteronomy: the destruction of idolatry (2 Kgs. xxiii. 4 f., 10–15, 19 f.: see Deu. iv. 15 ff., 23, 25 ff.; vii. 5,

In view of these facts it is evident that there is no support for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in the historical books written before the Exile.

Moses is twice (Jer. xv. 1; Mic. vi. 4) mentioned by the prophets who wrote before the Exile; but in both cases, as in Hos. xii. 14/13, where he is not named, he appears in the character of a deliverer only. The same is the case in Isa. lxiii. 11 and 12; but in Mal. iii. 22/iv. 4 and Dan. ix. 11 and 13 he figures as the national lawgiver. The law to which Malachi refers, however, as the use of the name Horeb for the sacred mountain would indicate, is probably Deuteronomy.* The extent of the one referred to in Daniel is uncertain.†

The name of Moses occurs nearly twice as often in the later as it does in the earlier histories, exclusive of Joshua.‡ In the first place, most of the references to him in the books of Kings are repeated.§ It would be natural to expect their significance to be the same in both connections. This, however, is not the case. It is clear,

25 f.; xii. 2 f.; xvi. 21 f.; xxvii. 15); the suppression of soothsayers, etc. (2 Kgs. xxiii. 24; see Deu. xviii. 10 f.); the abolition of high places (2 Kgs. xxiii. 8; see Deu. xii. 4, 13; xvi. 5); the concentration of worship at Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xxiii. 8 f., 23; see Deu. xii. 5 ff., 26 f.; xiv. 23 ff.; xv. 19 f.; xvi. 2, 6, 11, 15 f.; xxvi. 2; xxxi. 11).

* See Deu. i. 2, 6; etc. Wellhausen (*SV*, V. 202) calls attention to the fact that in Malachi (ii. 1 ff.), as in Deuteronomy, there is no distinction between priests and Levites.

† Bevan connects the verses cited with *v.* 2 of the same chapter, and all with Lev. xxvi. 18 ff. Comp. Behrmann.

‡ He is mentioned only sixteen times in Judges, Samuel, and Kings; but thirty-one times in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

§ With 1 Kgs. ii. 3 compare 1 Chr. xxii. 13; with 2 Kgs. xiv. 6, 2 Chr. xxv. 4; with 2 Kgs. xxi. 8, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 8; with 2 Kgs. xxii. 8, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 14; and with 2 Kgs. xxiii. 21, 2 Chr. xxxv. 6, 12. For 1 Kgs. viii. 53 and 56, and 2 Kgs. xviii. 6 and 12 there are no parallels in the books of Chronicles.

e. g., as has already been noted, that in 1 Kgs. ii. 3 the author has in mind Deuteronomy; but the introduction of the matter of the temple into the parallel narrative makes it probable that, in 1 Chr. xxii. 13, what is meant by "the statutes and judgments which Yahweh commanded Moses" is a more extensive collection. But the most interesting and instructive of these parallel passages is the Chronicler's account of the reformation under Josiah (2 Chr. xxxiv. 1 ff.) The author of the books of Kings constantly reminds one of Deuteronomy; but in Chronicles the details which produce this impression are either omitted or transposed,* while the brief notice of Josiah's passover is expanded into an elaborate report betraying an acquaintance with the legislation of the middle books as well as with that of Deuteronomy.† This means that, although, according to the earlier writer, the book found was Deuteronomy, according to the later it was the completed Pentateuch. It is this larger "law" to which the Chronicler refers in the additional cases (except Neh. ix. 14) in which Moses is mentioned. The most important are three in which the book made the basis of the covenant of 444 B. C. is attributed to Moses. The first (Neh. viii. 1) simply describes it as "the book of the law of Moses:" but, of the other two, one (Neh. viii. 14.), expressly cites Lev. xxiii. 42 and the other (Neh. xiii. 1 f.), Deu. xxiii. 4/3 f. See also Neh. x. 30/29 f., and Deu. vii. 3 and viii. 11. Add to the evidence of these passages the fact that the first half of the prayer

* In Chronicles the purgation of the land is described in much briefer terms than in Kings, and represented as begun in Josiah's twelfth year (2 Chr. xxxiv. 3) and completed before the discovery of the law by Hilkiah (*v.* 8).

† Notice especially 2 Chr. xxxv. 13; which seems to have been dictated by a desire to harmonize Ex. xii. 8 f. with Deu. xvi. 7.

of the Levites in Neh. ix. is a *résumé* of the contents of the Pentateuch, and the identity of the two books seems established.*

It is possible that the authors of some of the remaining books of the Hebrew canon shared the opinion of that (or those) of the great work now divided into the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; but, since none of them found occasion to connect the name of Moses with the Pentateuch or anything that can be mistaken for it, their attitude on the subject cannot be determined. On the other hand, there is no doubt what the later Jews thought about it. In the Talmud the only question is, whether the words of the Mishna, "Moses wrote his book," † are to be taken absolutely, or with such latitude that the last eight verses of Deuteronomy, describing the death and burial of the lawgiver, may be regarded as an addition made by his successor.‡ The extreme view

* There are other passages which it may be worth while to mention in this connection. Some of them refer to certain of the contents of the Pentateuch as parts of the law of Moses. See 1 Chr. vi. 33/48 f. (Num. iii. f.; Lev. viii. f.); 1 Chr. xv. 15 (Num. iv. 15); 2 Chr. viii. 13 (Num. xxviii. f.); 2 Chr. xxiv. 6, 9 (Ex. xxx. 11 ff.); 2 Chr. xxx. 16 (Num. xviii. 1 ff.); and Neh. i. 7 ff. (Deu. xxx. 1 ff.). The rest represent this law as in the form of a book. See 2 Chr. xxiii. 18; Ezr. iii. 2 (Num. xxviii. f.); and Ezr. vi. 18 (Lev. viii. f.; Num. iii. f.). See also Ezr. vii. 6.

† *Baba Bathra*, 14b.

‡ The discussion of the question is an excellent example of rabbinical dialectics and, as such, well worth quoting. It runs as follows:

"It is said that Joshua wrote his book and eight verses in the law. On what authority is it said, Eight verses of the law Joshua wrote? On the authority of, And Moses the servant of Yhwh died there [Deu. xxxiv. 5]. Is it possible that Moses, while yet alive, wrote, And he died there? Nay; but thus far Moses wrote, and from this point onward Joshua wrote. — These are the words of

seems to have been the more popular. At any rate, this is the one adopted by both Philo and Josephus. The former declares that "while still alive he [Moses] prophesied admirably what should happen to himself after his death," * and the latter uses similar language.† The Jews were so jealous for the glory of Moses that they would not let even Ezra share with him the authorship of the law. The latter, therefore, was represented, not

R. Judah, or, some say, R. Nehemiah. R. Simeon said to him, Is it possible that the book of the law wanted a single character, since it is written [Deu. xxxi. 26], Take this book of the law? Nay; but thus far the Holy One, blessed be he, spoke and Moses wrote, and from that point onward the Holy One, blessed be he, spoke and Moses wrote with tears; as is further said [Jer. xxxvi. 18], And Barukh said to them, With his mouth he pronounced, etc."

* He calls attention to the minuteness with which Moses writes, "relating how he had died, when he was not yet dead; and how he was buried without any one present to know of his tomb; — because, in fact, he was entombed, not by mortal hands, but by immortal powers; so that he was not placed in the tomb of his forefathers, having met with particular grace which no man ever saw; — and mentioning, further, how the whole nation mourned for him with tears a whole month, displaying the individual and general sorrow on account of his unspeakable benevolence toward each individual and toward the collective host, and of the wisdom with which he had ruled them." *Works*, iii. 135; see also 83 f., 113 f.

† He clearly intends to attribute all the legislation of the Pentateuch to Moses (*AJ*, iii. 12, 3; iv. 8, 3; 44, 46). He also regards Moses as the author of the books in which this legislation is preserved (*AJ*, x. 4, 2). He calls them "the holy books of Moses laid up in the temple." Comp. v. 1, 17. In his work *Contra Apion* he is more definite: for he says (i. 1, 8) that, of the twenty-two books composing the Scriptures of his people, "five belong to Moses; which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind until his death." Finally, he asserts (*AJ*, iv. 8, 48) that Moses "wrote in the holy books that he died; which was done out of fear lest they should venture to say that because of his extraordinary virtue he went to God."

as the compiler, but as the inspired restorer, after its destruction, of this as well as the other portions of their Scriptures.*

Jesus and his early disciples were Jews, and, as such, shared to a greater or less extent the traditional opinions of their countrymen. They would naturally, therefore, think and speak of the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. That they actually did thus think and speak, it is very easy to show. The evangelists, *e. g.*, themselves use the same terms in referring to the Pentateuch as other Jews, and they represent their Master also as employing them.† He uses the terms "law of Moses" (Lu. xxiv. 44) and

* The legend is found in 4 Esd. xiv. Ezra says: "Thy law is burnt; therefore no man knoweth the things that are done of thee, and the works that shall begin. But, if I have found grace before thee, send the Holy Spirit unto me, and I will write all that hath been done in the world since the beginning, the things that were written in thy law, that men may find thy path, and that they which live in the latter days may live" (*vv.* 21 f.). God answers: "Take with thee Sarea, Dabria, Selemia, Ecanus, and Asiel, these five, which are ready to write swiftly, and come hither; and I will light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out till the things be performed which thou shalt begin to write." (*vv.* 24 f.). When, after forty days, the work has been completed, God commands: "The first twenty-four that thou hast written publish openly, that the worthy and the unworthy may read them; but keep the last seventy, that thou mayest deliver them only to such as be wise among the people" (*vv.* 45 f.).

† The evangelists themselves connect the name of Moses with the Pentateuch as a whole, Lu. xxiv. 27; Jno. i. 17, 45; with a particular passage, Lu. ii. 23. Other Jews are represented as attributing to Moses the Pentateuch as a whole, Jno. ix. 28 f.; particular passages, Mat. xix. 7 (Mar. x. 4); xxii. 24 (Mar. xii. 19; Lu. xx. 28); Jno. viii. 5. Jesus is represented as connecting the name of Moses with the Pentateuch as a whole, Mat. xxiii. 2; Lu. xvi. 29, 31; xxiv. 44; Jno. v. 45 f.; vii. 19; with particular passages, Mat. viii. 4 (Mar. i. 44; Lu. v. 14); xix. 8 (Mar. x. 3); Mar. vii. 10; xii. 26 (Lu. xx. 37); Jno. vii. 22 f.

"book of Moses" (Mar. xii. 26), but generally, when he refers to the Pentateuch he employs the briefer "Moses," and that in such a way as to indicate that the book and the man are associated in his mind in the relation of the work to its author.* When the gospel spread among the gentiles, they received with it the Old Testament and the traditions then current respecting its origin. Thus the Jewish doctrine of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch became the doctrine of the Christian church,† in which, for fifteen centuries, it was transmitted almost unquestioned.‡

* See especially the expressions "Moses showed in the Bush" (Lu. xx. 37) and "Moses and the Prophets" (Lu. xvi. 29). These and other passages of the same sort from the Old or the New Testament are sometimes given a different interpretation, certain who feel forced to admit that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses asserting that the terms found in them may have been suggested by the prominence of Moses in the work: and the use of "Esther" in such expressions as "Esther teaches," etc., is cited in support of this position (Briggs, *HCH*, 20 ff.). The answer is, that the names of persons when connected with books do not always have the same significance; that the significance in any given case must be determined by the circumstances under which the name is employed; and that, in the case of Moses, the universal prevalence, about the beginning of the Christian era, of the belief that he wrote the Pentateuch, is good ground for assuming that, when his name was connected with the book by the writers of the period, especially if the book was cited as an authority, the terms used expressed, and were intended to express, the current doctrine.

† The passages from the remaining books of the New Testament bearing on this subject are the following: The Pentateuch as a whole is attributed to Moses, Acts vi. 11, 14; xiii. 39; xxi. 21; xxvi. 22; xxviii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 9; Heb. vii. 14; x. 28; particular passages, Acts iii. 22; xv. 1; Rom. x. 5, 19.

‡ Origen (*C. Cels.* ii. 54) adopted the stricter Jewish doctrine.

III. Structure and Composition

The discussion just concluded has shown that, although the Pentateuch itself does not claim to have been written by Moses, and earlier authorities persistently ignore its existence, the New Testament, as well as the later books of the Old, attribute it to him, and this is the traditional doctrine of both the Jewish and the Christian church. The question now arises whether the testimony of the last two authorities is to be accepted as decisive. There are those who reply without hesitation in the affirmative; arguing that even the latest of the sacred writers were so much nearer the Mosaic age than modern scholars that it is impertinence in the latter to question the statements or implications of the former, that this impertinence becomes presumption in view of the inspiration of the writers quoted, and that the offense amounts to impiety when Jesus' relation to the subject is considered.* These arguments are as weak as they are unfair. In reply to the first it is only necessary to say that, if, as is generally admitted, the value of testimony depends upon the distance of the witness from the event to which he testifies, it certainly is not favorable to the traditional doctrine that the support for it comes from witnesses none of whom lived within a thousand years of the time of Moses. The second argument takes for granted that inspiration insures infallibility; a doctrine for which there is no ground in reason or experience, and of which there is no example in the history of revelation. The third is as good an example of the *argumentum ad verecundiam* as could be cited. It should neither deceive nor terrify anybody. The truth is, that Jesus never claimed to be

* Green, *HCP*, 33; Harman, *IHS*, 258 f.; *Lex Mosaica* (G. Rawlinson), 44 ff.

omniscient, but, on the other hand, on at least one occasion (Mar. xiii. 32), confessed that his knowledge was limited.* There is, therefore, no impiety in facing the possibility of discovering another example of such limitation, and asking in all humility and reverence, whether the Pentateuch *can* have been written by Moses ; a question the answer to which involves a careful study of the structure and composition of the work.

One cannot proceed far with the examination proposed without suspecting that the Pentateuch is not the product of a single pen. In fact this idea suggests itself to the unprejudiced mind at the outset ; for there is nothing clearer than that the first two chapters of Genesis contain two accounts of creation, i. 1–ii. 4a and ii. 4b–25, differing from each other in almost every respect in which they may be compared. In the first place, there is a decided difference in their vocabularies. The most striking example under this head is found in the names given to the Creator, *God* being the one used in the first, and *Yahweh* (*God*) that employed in the second account ; † but there are several others of almost equal importance.‡

* See also Lu. ii. 52. Some prefer to meet this point by appealing to Jno. xvi. 12, where Jesus is reported to have told his disciples that there were many things which he wished to tell his disciples but could not, because they were not prepared to understand or appreciate them ; and explaining that the authorship of the Pentateuch may well have been one of the things reserved for future revelation, the discussion of which he avoided by adopting the language, but not the opinion, of the day (Briggs, *HCH*, 29).

† This difference was noticed by some of the Christian fathers, *e. g.*, Tertullian (*Adv. Hermogenem*, c. 3) and Augustine (*De Genesi ad litteram*, iii. 2) ; but its significance was misunderstood.

‡ Thus, *e. g.*, in the first account the word that describes God's creative activity is either the generic term עשה, *make* (i. 7, 16, 25, 26, 31 ; ii. 2, 3), or the more specific ברא, *create* (i. 1, 21, 27 ; ii. 3, 4) ; while in the second, although עשה is found (ii. 4, 18), the

Secondly, not only are the words used in the two accounts largely different, but those of the first are different in kind from those of the second. Indeed, the style of the one varies throughout from that of the other; the first being literal and prosaic, while the second is as noticeably picturesque and poetical.* Thirdly, while these narratives agree in certain fundamental matters, *e. g.*, in tracing the origin of the world to an intelligent God, and placing man first among his creatures, it must be acknowledged that, in the details of creation, they are clearly and irreconcilably divergent.† Finally, these narratives

more characteristic term is יצר, *form* (ii. 7, 8, 19), or בנה, *build* (ii. 22). In the former יצא, *go forth*, is used of both plants and animals (i. 12, 24), in the latter the corresponding words are צמח, *sprout* (ii. 5, 9), and יצר (ii. 19). Finally, the first account generally has ארץ, *earth* (i. 11, 12, 24, 26, 28, 30), and חית הארץ, *beast of the earth* (i. 25, 30), where the second has אדמה, *ground* (ii. 5, 6, 7, 9, 19), and חית השדה, *beast of the field* (ii. 19, 20).

* The peculiarities of the style of the first account are seen in the logical character of the narrative, the uniform structure of the sections of which it is composed, and the recurrence of cognates in such expressions as הדשיא דשא, lit. *green greenness* (i. 11), הזריע זרע, lit. *seed seed* (i. 12), שרץ שרץ, lit. *swarm a swarm* (i. 20), etc. There is none of this formality in the second account. It produces the impression of a series of dissolving views. One of the most vivid and delightful of these pictures is that in which Yahweh is described as first *moulding* man into shape, as a potter would fashion a dish, and then *breathing into his nostrils*, thus transforming the hitherto lifeless clay into a living creature. The description of the creation of the animals is equally vivid, while the last words, "but for man there was not found a help meet for him," gives it an element of pathos.

† The second is not so complete an account of God's work as the first; but this is not so remarkable as the fact that they do not agree in the details common to them. In the first God is represented as creating vegetation (i. 11 ff.), animals (i. 20 ff.), man (i. 26 ff.), one after another. The second begins where the first ends

give evidence that they were written from different standpoints and with different objects in view; the first being the work of some one, doubtless a priest, devoted to the study of Hebrew institutions, the second, that of a prophet, or some one else whose interests were predominantly ethical and religious.*

The example cited is not a solitary instance. One after another the reader discovers a succession of duplicates, whose existence cannot be explained on the supposition that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses or any other single author.† If he is at all critical he also discovers places in which parallel passages have been inter-

(ii. 7), but postpones the creation of woman (ii. 21 ff.) until after that of vegetation (ii. 8 ff.) and animals (ii. 19 ff.); and this order is intentional, for the author evidently thought that vegetation was originally dependent on the care of man and that woman was, in a sense, an afterthought.

* Note that the interest of the first account culminates in the sanctification of the sabbath, while the most significant thing about the second is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

† The following are among the most noticeable: The story of the covenant of God with Noah has two forms, Gen. viii. 20–22 and ix. 8–17; so, also, that with Abraham, Gen. xv. and xvii. Gen. xx. and xxvi. 1–11 are clearly but two versions of one tradition. The same is just as evidently the case with xxi. 22–32, and xxvi. 12–31. The origin of the name "Bethel" is described in two different passages, xxviii. 10–22 and xxxv. 9–15; Jacob twice receives the name "Israel," Gen. xxxii. 22–32 and xxxv. 9–13; and there are two lists of the dukes of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 15–19 and 40–43. Nor are these repetitions confined to Genesis. In Exodus the revelation of the name *Yahweh* is narrated in iii. 13–15, and again in vi. 2–7. In chapters xii. f. there are duplicate directions concerning the passover, xii. 1–13 and 21–27; the feast of unleavened bread, xii. 14–20 and xiii. 3–10; and the first-born, xiii. 1 f. and 11–16. In xxxiii. 7–11 there is a fragment of a second account of the tabernacle. Finally, Deuteronomy is largely a repetition of the history and legislation of the three preceding books.

woven into more or less consistent composite narratives. A good example is the story of the Flood, Gen. vi. 5–viii. 14. The substance of it is, that, the earth having become corrupt, God determined to destroy it, and actually caused a deluge, in which every living thing, excepting Noah and his family and a few animals, perished; and so long as one reads it in outline only, it seems perfectly clear and coherent. Not so when one asks how many animals were preserved, or how long the deluge lasted; for on these points its statements are so divergent that one is forced to attribute them to different authors.*

The incongruity of parts of the Pentateuch appears most clearly when one undertakes to trace its chronology. The story that Abimelech, attracted by the beauty of Sarah, took her from her supposed brother (Gen. xx.), is not in itself improbable. The difficulty in believing it arises from the fact that it is so placed as to make the woman ninety years of age when she was kidnapped. See xvii. 17. But the most convincing illustration of this sort is found in a series of references to Judah, the son of Jacob (Gen. xxxviii.) He is said to have married a daughter of the Canaanite Shua, by whom he had three sons (*vv.* 2 ff.). After the youngest of these was grown (*v.* 14.), Tamar bore him two sons (*vv.* 29 f.); one of whom, Perez, had two sons when the Hebrews migrated to Egypt (xlvi. 12). Yet, according to xxxvii. 2, xxxviii. 1, xli. 46, 53, and xlv. 6, the time within which all this occurred was only *twenty-two years.*† These facts can

* There are many other examples of this sort. The most instructive are the story of the banishment of Jacob, Gen. xxvi. 34–xxviii. 9; of the sale of Joseph, Gen. xxxvii.; of the mission of the spies, Num. xiii. f.; and of the rebellion of Korah and others, Num. xvi. 1–35.

† An attempt to fix the ages of Dinah and her brothers when the

only be explained on the theory of diversity of authorship. It must therefore be admitted that the Pentateuch is a compilation. The only question concerns the number of writers represented and the process by which their contributions were united into a single work.

The first effect of the discoveries described is to confuse the student, and incline him to conclude that the Pentateuch is a mass of fragments, whose authorship it is useless to discuss, thrown into its present form at a comparatively late date by a careless or incompetent compiler. This is the conclusion actually reached by Spinoza (1670), the father of the so-called Fragmentary Hypothesis,* first proposed, as such, by Geddes (1800),† and fully

incident narrated in Gen. xxxiv. occurred will disclose other similar difficulties.

* Spinoza (*TTP*, ix.) thus expresses himself: "Any one who but observes that in these five books precept and narrative are jumbled together without order, that there is no regard to time, and that one and the same story is often met with again and again, and occasionally with very important differences in the incidents, — whoever observes these things, I say, will certainly come to the conclusion, that in the Pentateuch we have merely notes and collections to be examined at leisure, materials for history rather than digested history itself."

† Geddes' statement, found in the preface to his (unfinished) translation of the Bible (xix.), runs as follows: "Moses, who had been *taught all the wisdom of the Egyptians*, most probably was the first Hebrew writer, or the first who applied writing to historical composition. From his journals a great part of the Pentateuch seems to have been compiled. Whether he were also the original author of the Hebrew cosmogony and of the history prior to his own days, I would neither confidently affirm nor positively deny. He certainly *may* have been the original author or compiler; and may have drawn the whole or a part of his cosmogony and general history, both before and after the Deluge, from the archives of Egypt; and these original materials, collected first by Moses, may have been worked up into their present form by the compiler of

developed by Vater (1805), who states it as follows: "The books of the Pentateuch consist of a multitude of separate pieces, large and small, some very small, concerning which it is clear, not that they were composed with reference to one another, and for the purpose of being attached to one another, but the contrary. Further, among these separate pieces many are evidently, and most at least probably, by different authors. . . . The more probable opinion . . . is, that a considerable part of Deuteronomy existed from, at the latest, the age of Solomon or David, that separate pieces which we now find in the Pentateuch were gradually composed, and that the collection had a later origin, perhaps toward the time of the Exile." *

These supposed fragments, however, when examined, are found to have affinities in accordance with which they arrange themselves in series with well defined characteristics. Thus, *e. g.*, one version of the covenant with Noah (Gen. ix. 8 ff.) calls the Deity *God*, and otherwise reminds one of the first account of creation; while the other (viii. 20 ff.) uses the name *Yahweh*, and, in general, follows the style of thought as well as language of the second account. Indeed, almost the entire contents of the first nineteen chapters of Genesis can be classed as either Elohistic or Yahwistic. The same is true of the remainder of the first four books of the Pentateuch; but from the twentieth chapter of Genesis onward there are two kinds of Elohistic materials, only one of which can have been supplied by the source of Gen. i. and Ex. vi. 3,

the Pentateuch in the reign of Solomon. But it is also possible, and, I think, more probable, that the latter was the first collector, and collected from such documents as he could find either among his own people or among the neighboring nations."

* *CP*, iii. 504, 680. See also Hartmann, *HKF*, 584.

the other being furnished by the writer (or writers) whose preference for the name "God" is explained in Ex. iii. 14. On the other hand, nearly the whole of Deuteronomy is written in a style, and characterized by a tone, of which there is hardly a trace in any of the preceding books.*

There are two ways of explaining these facts: In the first place, one might suppose that the original work was a homogeneous document in the style of the Elohist or the Yahwist, and that the remaining contents of the Pentateuch were added by successive revisers. This was, in fact, at one time the prevalent theory. It is the Supplementary Hypothesis, broached by Kelle† (1812), of which Bleek is perhaps the best representative. His statement of it (abridged) is as follows:‡ "The first continuous historical work, distinct traces of which appear in the works remaining to us, dealt connectedly with the history from the creation up to the death of Joshua, or up to the occupation and partition of the land of Canaan; and its composition took place, in all probability, in the time of Saul. . . . This work is that of the so-called *Elohist*. . . . It contained the bulk of the contents of the first four books of our Pentateuch, also the account of the death of Moses (substantially Deu. xxxiv. 1–8), and the greater part of the book of Joshua. . . . This work was enlarged and revised by a somewhat later author, probably in the time of David, and in not quite

* There is difference of opinion with reference to the amount of Deuteronomic material in the first four books, but Gen. xxvi. 5, Ex. x. 2, xv. 26, xix. 4–6, xx. 3b–6, xxiii. 24 and 32 f., and xxxiv. 12 f. and 15 f., at least, seem to be of this character.

† *VWMS*, iii. He asked, "Could not Genesis be represented as a book, originally well arranged, whose plan has been disturbed by a large number of interpolations due to the successive crystallization of oral traditions current among the people?"

‡ *EAT*, 141 ff. (Eng. i. 362 ff.).

the last of his reign. The older document remained the basis; but it was enlarged by many new sections, a part of which the author found already written, a part also being oral traditions which he himself put into writing. The narratives of the earlier document were also, to some extent, revised, additions and alterations, or abridgments and omissions, being made where the *Jehovist* used further sources respecting the same circumstances and events. . . . Next came the last revision of the work by *the author of Deuteronomy*,* from whom it received the form and extent which it now presents in the Pentateuch, and the book of Joshua. . . . The composition of Deuteronomy and the last revision of the Pentateuch, in all probability, are to be referred to the reign of King Manasseh, in the first half of the seventh century B. C." Colenso, the former bishop of Natal, also, was an advocate of this hypothesis.†

* De Wette (1805) was the first to recognize in Deuteronomy an independent document of the seventh century B. C.

† This is his form of it: "The Elohistic story in Gen. i.–Ex. vi. 5 was written in the latter part of Samuel's time, perhaps by Samuel himself after the rupture with Saul. . . . The writer . . . left it now to be filled up and continued by younger hands. Accordingly, this was done by the Jehovistic writer or writers of the following age, trained, no doubt, in the same school and under the very eye of Samuel. . . . From the time when the O. S. was completed, . . . in the early years of Solomon, with the addition of the older portions of Judges and Ruth, . . . 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 Kings, the work . . . remained untouched . . . till the days of Jeremiah (the Deuteronomist), who . . . retouched and enlarged it in his own prophetical style, and ultimately inserted the law in Deu. v. ff., . . . the discovery of which gave rise to Josiah's reformation (2 Kgs. xxiii.). To this he added, some time afterwards, the introduction, Deu. i.–iv., and the later chapters xxix. f., as well as the history of the kings from Solomon downwards, contained in the two books of Kings. . . . Finally, during the first years of Jehoachin's

The Supplementary Hypothesis was widely accepted; but it finally had to be abandoned because it did not take into account that the so-called supplemental portions of the Pentateuch are more closely connected with one another than with the context in which they are found, and that, when taken by themselves, they form as complete a narrative as one could hope to recover from a composite production. These, however, are the facts. Thus, the second account of creation, as is shown by its form and content, is not a supplement to the first, but an introduction to the story of the Fall (iii.), the first genealogy (iv. 1, 16b–24), a notice of Noah (v. 29; ix. 20–27), etc. But these facts require one to suppose that the Jehovistic as well as the Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch originally constituted an independent document. When, therefore, in the progress of research and discussion they had been established, the Supplementary gave place to the Documentary Hypothesis.

The Documentary Hypothesis logically comes last in the list of theories passed in review; nor did it obtain the favor that it now enjoys until the other two had been tried and found wanting; but, as a matter of fact, it is the oldest of the three, for it was proposed by Astruc, its inventor, in 1753. This is its original form: "Moses had, I believe, collected twelve different memoirs, or fragments of memoirs, which concerned the creation of the world, the universal deluge, the history of the patri-

captivity, Ezekiel followed the example of Jeremiah by writing Lev. xviii., xx., and xxvi. . . . His work was taken up, during the Captivity and after it, by a series of priestly writers. . . . Very probably Ezra, and the priests his companions, had a large share in this work, and it seems to have been brought very nearly to a close in his days, so far as the Hebrew text is concerned; though it may have received some touches even after that time" (*PBJ*, Part VI. 616 ff.). See also Tuch, *Genesis*.

archs, and especially that of Abraham and his posterity. For his purpose he arranged these, either entire or in extracts, in twelve different columns, and placed each part of a memoir or fragment in the place appropriate for it over against other corresponding parts or fragments, thus compiling a work in twelve columns. Perhaps, however, to avoid the confusion of so many columns, he arranged all his memoirs in only four columns. . . . We should be happy, and much pains would be spared, if Genesis had come down to us in this form. But the copyists long ago disarranged it in transcribing it." * These suggestions were at first received with ridicule, and an attempt by Ilgen (1798) to improve upon them † was

* *CG*, 432 ff. This hypothesis, be it observed, was originally intended to serve as a defence of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

† Ilgen's work is entitled *Die Urkunde des jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt*, I. In it (425) he states his theory as follows: "After a careful examination of the text of Genesis, in which I have faithfully followed the clues furnished by the headings, the frequent repetitions, the divergence in language and tone, and the varying and entirely contradictory contents, I have found that the documents which the collector had before him and combined belong to three different authors, of whom two use the name *Elohim*, and the third *Jahveh*. I call those who use the name *Elohim*, or the Elohists, *Sopher Eliel* (*God is my God*), to indicate that they are characterized by the use of the name *Elohim*; but the one who uses the name *Jahveh* I call *Sopher Elijah* (*My God is Jah*), because the portions that belong to him are distinguished by *Jahveh*. To distinguish them from each other, I give to one Eliel the epithet *Harishon* (*the first*), and to the other the epithet *Hashsheni* (*the second*); Elijah, also, has the epithet *Harishon*. In the latter case it may seem superfluous, since he stands alone, and therefore does not need to be distinguished from any other; but it is possible that, in the future, he may not remain the only one, that another may make his appearance, when the distinction will be necessary."

ignored; but a form of Astruc's theory championed by Eichhorn (1780), who extended his researches through the Pentateuch, for a time enjoyed considerable favor.* This, however, was finally superseded by the Supplementary Hypothesis, whose prevalence even Ewald, with his elaborate and ingenious modifications (1843), was not able to prevent.†

It was Hupfeld (1853) who, having independently, as he claims, reached the result published fifty years before by Ilgen,‡ gave the deathblow to the Supplementary

* The following is the form in which he put it in the fourth (1823) edition of his *Einleitung:* "The first book of Moses was compiled of fragments from two works by different authors. . . . It seems to me probable that the two documents were brought into the form in which we now have them at the end, or soon after the end, of the Mosaic period. . . . The contents of the last four books of Moses prove that, with the exception of late additions, they are derived entirely from documents contemporaneous with the Mosaic legislation. Not that all these documents were written by Moses himself, but a great part of them by some of his contemporaries. . . . The Mosaic books seem to have received their present division and form between Joshua and Samuel." (iii. 64, 93, 334, 350.)

† The following is Ewald's view in its final (1864) form: He finds in the Pentateuch and Joshua the work of seven hands: (1) the Book of Covenants, by a Judaite who wrote about the beginning of Samson's judgeship; (2) the Book of Origins, by a Levite who wrote soon after the dedication of Solomon's temple; (3) a third version of the primitive history, by an Israelite of the tenth or the ninth century B. C.; (4) a fourth element, by a Jew of the ninth or the eighth century; (5) a fifth, by the compiler of the preceding sources, a Jew of the second half of the eighth century; (6) Deuteronomy, by an Egyptian Jew of the latter half of the reign of Manasseh; (7) the editorial additions of the final compiler, who completed the work about 700 B. C. (*HI*, i. 64 ff.)

‡ He says in the preface (viii. ff.) to *Die Quellen der Genesis* that, although he had read Ilgen's book, he had entirely forgotten it until his own was nearly finished; then he came upon it and found in it much of which he had supposed himself the discoverer.

Hypothesis and revived its neglected rival. He epitomizes the contents of his book as follows: "There lie at the foundation of Genesis (and of the Pentateuch in general) two distinct cycles of legends or forms of national tradition: . . . an older, simpler, . . . and a younger, enriched and adorned. . . . The former we have in the so-called Elohim document, the latter chiefly in the Jahwistic portions of the Pentateuch; along with which, however, a younger Elohist appears in connection with the principal characters in the theocratic history. . . . Both [of these last] forms of legend must have been independent of each other, and independently recorded. . . . The combination of the three documents in the present whole must be simply the work of a later editor." * The publication of these results marked the beginning of a new period in the history of Pentateuchal criticism; for, from that date, the Documentary Hypothesis has grown in favor, and it is now, in some form, accepted by nearly all recognized authorities in biblical criticism.†

The prevalent hypothesis makes the Pentateuch a compilation from at least four documents. These documents, being the work of as many different authors, when intact presented linguistic and other peculiarities by which they were readily distinguishable. The excerpts from them have, in some cases, been handled so freely in the process of compilation that it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate them; but as a rule they have been preserved in so nearly their original form that there is little room for doubt with reference to their authorship. In fact, the Pentateuch has been analyzed, and the greater

* *QG*, 98 f., 193, 195.

† Klostermann (*Der Pentateuch*, 1893), who still prefers a form of the Supplementary Hypothesis, is one of the few exceptions.

part of its contents more or less satisfactorily referred to one or another of the documents in question.*

The work from which the first account of creation is an extract, whose author (or authors) was formerly known as the Elohist because at first he calls the Deity *God* (*'elohim*), and the first Elohist, to distinguish him from the one discovered by Ilgen, is now generally called the Priests' Code, or the Priestly document, and more briefly designated as PC or simply P, † because it was evidently written from the sacerdotal standpoint. In one view it is the most important of the sources of the Pentateuch; for it furnished, not only the framework of the whole, but the largest share of the materials of which it is composed, including, according to the best authorities, about a fifth of Genesis, nearly a half of Exodus, the whole of Leviticus, nearly three-fourths of Numbers, and a few verses in Deuteronomy. It began with an account of the origin of the race, and traced the history of the Hebrews and their institutions as far as the occupation of Palestine. The style of the extracts from it, even after Ex. vi. 2, where the name *Yahweh* is introduced, ‡ is unmistakable. It is logical and orderly beyond that of either of the other documents.§ It is also very precise, abounding in literal

* For a complete analysis of the Pentateuch, see Driver, *ILOT;* for a comparative view of the results reached by the leading critics, Holzinger, *EH.* The composition of the Pentateuch is indicated by Bacon (*GG; TTE*) by various sorts of type; by Haupt (*SBOT*) by different colors. See also Oxford *Hex.*

† Dillmann, who has a system of his own, designates it as A.

‡ On the significance of this passage, compare Green, *HCP*, 100 f.

§ The form of the first account of creation has already been noticed. The same peculiarity is illustrated by the division of the Priestly portions of Genesis into books of "generations." See ii. 4 (displaced); v. 1; vi. 9; etc.

and technical terms,* and in circumstantial definitions.† The contents of the document were largely legal, chronological, and genealogical; at any rate, this is the character of most of the portions of it that have been preserved.‡ They are also characterized by comparatively developed theological ideas, with an evident avoidance of the marvellous features of Hebrew tradition, as well as the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic language found in other parts of the Pentateuch.§ One does not look for literary effect in a work of this sort; yet there are pas-

* There are no better illustrations of the literal tendency of P than those found in the vocabulary of the first extract from it, Gen. i. 1 ff.; *e. g.*, *God*, *create*, i. 1; *be*=become, i. 2; *appear*, i. 9; *bring*, cause to go, *forth*, i. 12; etc.; the word *brood* (*A V*, *move*) being a noticeable exception. Compare also the word for *beget* in Gen. v. 3, for *destroy* in vi. 13, for *make*, of a covenant, in xvii. 7, for *offering* in Lev. i. 2, etc., with those used in Gen. iv. 18, vi. 7, xv. 17, iv. 4, etc. For a list of the linguistic peculiarities of this document see Driver, *ILOT*, 131 ff.; Holzinger, *EH*, 338 ff.; Oxford *Hex.* i. 208 ff.

† See the phrases, "and it was so," Gen. i. 7; "after its kind," i. 11; "and he died," v. 5; "on the same day," vii. 11; "after their families," x. 20, etc. Note also the fulness of mere detail in such passages as Gen. vi. 14–22, ix. 8–17, and xvii. 10–14.

‡ It is this document which explains the origin of the sabbath and circumcision in Genesis (ii. 1 ff.; xvii.), and records the complete development of the Hebrew religion in the legislation of Ex. xxxv.–Num. x. It is also the document to which we are indebted for the genealogies of Gen. v. and xi., containing the only biblical data for a chronology of the early history of the race.

§ The point here made may be illustrated by citing at random almost any passage from this document for which there is a parallel in the first four books of the Pentateuch. Compare, with especial reference to the use of anthropomorphisms, the first and second accounts of creation; and with reference to the introduction of the marvellous, Gen. xvii. with xv. (the covenant with Abraham), xxxv. 9 ff. with xxviii. 10 ff. (the name *Bethel*), and Ex. vi. 2 ff. with iii. 1 ff. (Moses' commission).

sages taken from it in which certain subjects are treated with a dignity that makes them deeply impressive.*

The second account of creation is from J, *i. e.*, the Jahvistic (more exactly Yahwistic) document, so named because it generally calls God *Jahveh*, or, better, *Yahweh*. To this document is referred about a half of Genesis, a sixth of Exodus, a fifteenth of Numbers, and a few verses in Deuteronomy. The Yahwistic portions of Genesis are recognizable by the divine name employed.† In the other books this criterion is of less service. There are, however, other marks by which they can generally be distinguished, especially from extracts from the Priestly document. The remains of the Yahwistic work show that the interests of its author (or authors) were predominantly religious, and that he wrote the history of his people for the purpose of imparting instruction in the truths that bear upon national and individual life and character. The materials, gleaned from the records and traditions of the Hebrews, therefore, are not regarded as a body of statements whose authenticity is to be guaranteed, but as a collection of illustrations, which may be expanded and embellished, and thus made to teach more clearly and eloquently than they otherwise would the lessons to be learned from them. The style is free and

* The first account of creation is generally considered a fine example of the sublime, and Gen. xxiii. an almost equally good one of the pathetic, in literature. It should, however, be observed that the impression made was evidently not intended on the part of the author; that, in fact, it is produced in spite of peculiarities that would spoil the effect of less impressive subjects.

† The name "God" occurs, also, without doubt as the original reading; *e. g.*, Gen. iii. 1; xxxii. 28; xliii. 29. In other cases it has been inserted, either with *Yahweh*, as in Gen. ii. f., or instead of it, as in Gen. vii. 9. See the Vulgate.

flowing, picturesque and poetical;* therefore always interesting, and sometimes highly dramatic.† The theology is naïve and primitive, God, *e. g.*, being sometimes represented, not only as possessing tangible parts and displaying human passions, but as associating familiarly with men.‡

The third source used in the compilation of the Pentateuch is E, the Elohistic document, so named because its author (or authors), like that of P, at first calls God *Elohim*. It has certain points of contact with J, — a fact which, with the added circumstance that the extracts from these two are more closely interwoven with one another than with those from other sources, sometimes makes it difficult to decide to which of them a given passage of the Pentateuch originally belonged. There are, however, criteria — as far as Ex. iii. 14, the divine name — by which some, at least, of the critics claim in most

* The picturesqueness of the second account of creation has already been noticed (p. 18 f.). For a list of the linguistic peculiarities of this document, see Holzinger, *EH*, 93 ff. or Oxford *Hex.* i. 185 ff.; for additional illustrations of vivid description, Gen. ix. 20 ff.; xi. 1 ff.; xv. 10 f., 17 f.; etc. Note also that the strictly poetical portions of the Pentateuch are largely from J; *e. g.*, Gen. iv. 23 f.; ix. 25 ff.; xxv. 23; xlix. 2 ff.

† The majority of the passages in the Pentateuch most interesting from the literary standpoint are from the Yahwistic document. See the story of the Fall (Gen. iii.), of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. xix.), of the mission of Eliezer (Gen. xxiv.), etc. Perhaps the prettiest picture from this source is that of the meeting between Jacob and Rachel (Gen. xxix. 2 ff.); the most dramatic, and one of the most effective in any language, is Judah's plea for Benjamin (Gen. xliv. 18 ff.).

‡ He makes a sound as he walks in the garden in Eden (Gen. iii. 8 f.); repents of having made man (Gen. vi. 6); comes down to see the city and tower of Babel (Gen. xi. 5); visits Abraham and accepts his hospitality (Gen. xviii. 1 ff.); etc.

cases to have settled the question. The result of the analysis is, that the Elohist is credited with having furnished more than a fourth of Genesis and Exodus, about a ninth of Numbers, and, like the rest, a few verses of Deuteronomy.* These parts of the Pentateuch betray the prophet's zeal for religion and morality, but it is mingled with an interest in theology and archæology. In other words, they abound, on the one hand, in traces of reflection on the things of God, and on the other, in details that no one but an antiquary would have inserted into his narrative.† It is probably an interest in antiquities, rather than a taste for poetry, that accounts for the fragments of ancient songs preserved in this document.‡ At any rate, although there are fine passages, the style of the work is less picturesque, and in general less attractive, than that of J.§

* For a complete analysis, which Driver does not attempt, see Bacon (*GG; TTE*) or Oxford *Hex.;* for a comparison of the views of the various critics, Holzinger (*EH*, ii.). The latter gives a list of the linguistic characteristics of E (181 ff.); so also Oxford *Hex.* i. 190 ff.

† The theological bent manifests itself in the use of the name *Elohim*, in the character of the theophanies described (Gen. xv. 1; xx. 3; etc.), in the instances of providential interference narrated (Gen. xxii. 13; xxxi. 9; xlv. 7; etc.), etc.; the archæological, in the preservation of the names of Eliezer (Gen. xv. 2), Deborah (Gen. xxxv. 8), Potiphar (Gen. xxxvii. 36), etc.; also of Mahanaim (Gen. xxxii. 21 f.), Dothan (Gen. xxxvii. 17), Pithom (Ex. i. 11), etc. Notice, finally, in this connection the allusions to idolatry among the early Hebrews (Gen. xxxi. 19 ff.; xxxv. 2 ff.).

‡ It is E in which is found the quotation from the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh" (Num. xxi. 14 f.). See also Ex. xv. 21; xvii. 16; etc.

§ The best Elohistic passages in the Pentateuch are Abraham's sacrifice (Gen. xxii. 1 ff.), Joseph's first interview with his brethren (Gen. xlii. 8 ff.), and the finding of Moses (Ex. ii. 1 ff.).

The fourth element in the composition of the Pentateuch is D, the Deuteronomic. The document so designated is found incorporated in the book of Deuteronomy. Its individuality is even more marked than that of either of the others. It is distinctly a prophetic production, aiming directly at the accomplishment of certain results, chief among which are the suppression of idolatry, the centralization of the worship of Yahweh, and the development of the moral and religious life. The ideas that underlie these aims, the unity and spirituality of God and the supreme duty of loving him (iv. 15 ff.; vi. 4 f.), are an advance upon the teachings of either J or E, but the style of this document, though fervid and lucid, is often diffuse, discursive, and repetitious.*

The decomposition of the Pentateuch on the lines indicated explains many of the peculiar phenomena observed, and removes many of the immemorial difficulties encountered, in it; but there are other phenomena that are not explained, and other difficulties that are not removed by so simple an analysis. Thus, *e. g.*, Gen. iii. and iv. are assigned to J, and they certainly display through-

* The tendency to diffuseness shows itself especially in the enumeration of particulars. See iv. 6, 9; vi. 7, 10 f.; vii. 13 f.; viii. 7 ff.; xii. 6, 18; etc. The second fault is well illustrated by the way in which the statutes and judgments, which first iv. 1, and then vi. 1, leads the reader to expect without further preparation, are postponed until the twelfth and the succeeding chapters. Instances of repetition are numerous. Thus the promise of restoration from captivity in iv. 29 ff. recurs in xxx. 1 ff.; the injunction concerning the remembrance of the law, found in vi. 6 ff., appears again in xi. 18 ff.; etc. Certain phrases peculiar to the document, such as "that it may be well with thee," etc.; "that thy days may be long," etc.; "the place which Yahweh shall choose," etc.; "with all thy heart," etc., are many times repeated. On the further peculiarities, see Holzinger, *EH*, 282 ff.; Driver, *ILOT*, 98 ff.; Kuenen, *OCH*, 110 ff.; Oxford *Hex.* i. 200 ff.

out some of the leading characteristics of that document; but the tree of life in iii. is a disturbing as well as an unnecessary feature in the story of the Fall, and in iv. the representation of Cain, or his son, as the founder of the first city, is hardly in harmony with the curse pronounced upon the murderer. These and other more or less apparent discrepancies indicate that the work in question, when it was incorporated with one or more of the others composing the Pentateuch, was not in its original form, but had been enriched with materials some of which may have been derived from other writings; * and similar indications in the other documents justify the conclusion that they, too, were the products of a process of development. The original work may be designated as J^1, etc., and later forms or additions as J^2, J^3, etc.

There are two distinct processes by which one can imagine the Pentateuch as having been compiled from the documents that compose it. In the first place, they might all have circulated as separate works until the last had reached its final form, and then have been put together by a single editor. The other process would be the gradual one, by which two of the documents would first be united, and this compilation afterward enlarged by the addition, one after the other, by the same or different editors, of the remaining two. Now it is agreed that the editorial additions discoverable in the Pentateuch are not all by one hand, and that, therefore, the former of these processes is not the one by which the compilation was actually produced. There remains, however, the question, whether this editorial work may not have been done by two compilers. Dillmann and others claim that

* For details concerning the composition of this document, see Budde, *BU;* Bruston, *DJ;* Holzinger, *EH*, 142 ff.; Kuenen, *OCH*, 250 ff.; Oxford *Hex.* i. 108 ff., 117 ff., 141 ff.

it was, three of the documents being put together by the first, and the one remaining united with the work thus produced by the second ; * but the majority of critics insist that the phenomena presented can only be explained on the supposition of a threefold redaction. The order of compilation, and the reasons for the theory adopted with reference to it, will be discussed in the next chapter.

IV. Age of Documents and Order of Compilation

The Documentary Hypothesis seems established. At any rate, it has been adopted by the leading Old Testament scholars of the day as the most satisfactory solution of the question of the origin of the Pentateuch yet suggested.† There is some divergence of opinion with reference to the analysis of its contents ; but it mostly touches minor matters concerning which perfect harmony is not important.‡ It is the final question respecting the dates of the several documents and of the stages in the process of compilation to which the most divergent answers have been given. On this critics divide themselves

* See Dillmann, *NDJ*, 671 ff. ; Kittel, *HH*, i. 132. Note, however, that they do not agree in their answers to the question, which three entered into the original compilation ; Dillmann's formula for the Pentateuch being PEJ + D, and Kittel's EJD + P.

† Its sturdiest American opponent was the late Professor Green of Princeton, whose *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* has already been cited. See also his *Moses and the Prophets*, *The Hebrew Feasts*, *The Unity of Genesis*, and a discussion with President Harper in *Hebraica* for 1888–91. The leading English conservatives have presented their case in a joint production under the title *Lex Mosaica*, edited by R. V. French.

‡ The following table, based on Holzinger's comparative analysis, exhibits both the degree and the character of the divergence among five acknowledged authorities concerning the Yahwistic

into two schools, one of which places J before E and P after the Exile, while the other insists that E is older than J and that P originated before the overthrow of Judah.* Of course, it is impossible, in this connection, to present all the evidence on which the adherents of

element in Gen. xxi.–xxx., the first ten chapters following the first extended extract from the Elohistic document:

	Dillmann.	Wellhausen.	Kuenen.	Cornill.	Bacon.
xxi.....	1a, 2a, 7, 32b*, 33, 34*.	.....	32–34.....	1a, 2a, 6b, 7, 33 (?).	1a, 2a, 6b, 7, 31–33.
xxii.....	20–24.....	20–24 (JE)....	14–18* (J^2), 20–24.	20–24 (J^2).....	20aβ–24.
xxiii.....					
xxiv.....	1–67.....	1–67.....	1–67.....	1–67.....	1–67.
xxv.....	5, 6* (?), 11b, 18a, 21–26a, 27–34.	1–6 (JE?), 11b, 18, 21–23, 24–26a (JE), 27–29 (JE), 30–34.	1–6, 11b, 18, 21–26a, 27–34.	1–6, 11b, 18, 21–26a, 27–34.	1–5, 11b, 18, 21–26a, 27–34.
xxvi.....	1b, 2aα, 3a, 7–14, 16 f., 19–33.	1–5*, 6–14, 16 f., 19–33.	1–5*, 6–14, 16 f., 19–33.	1–33*.....	1, 2aα, 3a, 6–14, 16 f., 19–32.
xxvii	15, 24–27, 30a, 35–38.	1–45 (JE).....	1–45 (mostly)..	1–45 (mostly)..	1a, 3*, 4bα, 5b, 6, 7 (partly), 15, 18bβ–20, 24–27, 29aα, 29b, 30aα, 30b, 31b–33, 36a, 41a, 45aα.
xxviii....	10, 13–16, 19a*, 21b (?).	13–16, 19a.....	13–16 (J^2), 17–22 (J^2, partly).	10, 13–16*, 19a.	10, 13 f., 16, 19a.
xxix.....	2–14, 15a (?), 26, 31–35.	26*, 31–35.....	1–30 (partly), 31–35.	2–14, 19–23, 25–28a, 30–35.	2–14a, 26, 31–35.
xxx.....	3b–5, 7, 9–16, 20b, 21*, 22bβ, 24 f., 27, 29–43.	3bβ, 7*, 9–16, 20b, 24 f., 27, 29–31, 35–43.	14–16, 24, 28–43.	1aα, 3bβ–5, 7, 9–16, 20b, 21, 22bβ, 23a, 24 f., 27 (?), 29–43.	3bβ, 4, 7*, 9–16, 20aβ–21, 22*, 24b, 25, 27, 29–31, 34–38a, 39, 40aα, 40b–43.

* The former of these schools is often called by the name of Graf, because he was the first (*GBAT*, 1866) to secure a hearing for the idea that P, or a part of it, was later than the other documents; but Reuss, his teacher, was the first (1834) to suggest this hypothesis, and Wellhausen has become its most prominent representative. The view of the last mentioned (*CH*) is substantially as follows: J belongs mostly to the golden period of Hebrew literature, the period preceding the destructive invasions of Palestine by the Assyrians; E is somewhat later. They both passed through

these schools base their conclusions; it would only confuse any one but an expert; but perhaps enough can be

two revisions before they were united. D appeared just before Josiah's reforms, and, after circulating for some time in two editions, produced after the fall of the Jewish monarchy, and finally taking a form combining the peculiarities of both, was combined with JE into a single work. The rest of the Pentateuch is later than Ezekiel. The nucleus of it is Q (the four, *quatuor*, covenants), about which was formed a conglomerate, the product of a school of writers, during and after the Exile. In 444 B. C. this Priests' code had been completed by the addition of Lev. xvii.–xxvi., wrought into JED, and divided into six books, the first five of which were the law promulgated by Ezra.

Kuenen's statement of Graf's theory (*OCH*) is more elaborate, varying, also, in some respects from that of Wellhausen. J, he thinks, was composed in the northern kingdom before, or about, 800 B. C.; E in the same country about 750. In the second half of the seventh century there had appeared Judean editions of both of them, which were united into a single work about 600. D, which was written in the reign of Josiah, after various additions, was combined with JE during the Captivity. Finally, P, itself a compilation made during, or after, the Exile, was brought to Judea by Ezra in 458 B. C., promulgated in 444, and, before 400, wrought into the preceding work to form the Hexateuch in substantially its present dimensions.

The most prominent representative of the second of the two schools above described is Dillmann, who states his view (NDJ, 593 ff.) about as follows: P (his A), though not the oldest of the sources of the Hexateuch, is only less ancient than E (his B), which is to be assigned to the first half of the ninth century B. C., while J (his C) dates from the middle of the eighth. About 600 these three were wrought into a continuous whole, to which D, written in the reign of Josiah, was added during the Exile. Finally, by the insertion of parts of Lev. xvii.–xxvi. and other related legislation (his S), also various legal fragments, and the separation of Joshua from the rest of the compilation, the law of Ezra, and the Pentateuch in substantially its present form, was completed.

Kittel, who is also a conservative, but differs on some points from Dillmann, thus states his conclusions: E was written near the beginning, J toward the end, of the ninth century B. C. The original

adduced to indicate what is likely to be the outcome of the discussion in progress.

The inquiry into the age of the Pentateuch may best begin with D; since it has been preserved more nearly complete than any of the other documents, and has certainly left more distinct traces of its influence than they in the history and the literature of the Hebrews. This document, as has already been shown, is the book on which were based the reforms of the eighteenth year of King Josiah. There is no doubt of its subsequent existence. From that time it was known and recognized as the law of Yahweh. The later prophets, especially Jeremiah,* repeatedly betray their acquaintance with, and their indebtedness to it, while the author (or authors) who put into their present form the books of Kings constantly gives evidence that it was not only his literary model, but the standard by which he decided how he

of Deuteronomy was a product of the reign of Manasseh. This last, after various additions, was united with the two preceding, hitherto distinct, documents during, or just before, the Captivity. Meanwhile P, the oldest parts of which, perhaps, date from the time of Solomon, had grown to its final proportions. It was carried by the Jews to Babylon, where it was worked into the previous compilation. The whole thus produced, minus the book of Joshua, was the law promulgated by Ezra.

* For a list of passages (86) from his prophecies, in which the influence of Deuteronomy is most apparent, see Zunz, *ZDMG*, 1873, 671 ff.; for a less complete one, Driver, *Deu.* xciii. or Oxford *Hex.* i. 87 ff. Jeremiah not only uses a large part of the vocabulary of the earlier book; he appropriates whole phrases and sentences. The following are good examples: vii. 23 (Deu. v. 30/33); xi. 4 (Deu. iv. 20); xvi. 13 (Deu. xxviii. 36); xxii. 8 (Deu. xxix. 23/24). The instances of this sort are so frequent and noticeable that several distinguished scholars, Gesenius (*GHS*, 32) and Colenso (*PBJ*, Part VII. 225 ff.) among their number, formerly held that the prophet was the author of both books.

should regard the men and the events of Hebrew history.* It is therefore impossible to deny that D, in some form, is as early, at the latest, as the date of Josiah's reforms.

In 2 Kgs. xxii. 8, Hilkiah is represented as saying that he had *found* the book sent to the king. The natural implication is, that it had previously been known and lost, and that, therefore, the author of this passage believed that it was not a recent production. That this really was his opinion, and the opinion of the school to which he belonged, is clear from xxiii. 25, where he calls the book discovered "the law of Moses," and a series of related passages, cited in another connection, which teach that it existed at various dates subsequent to that of the Exodus, and that it was always recognized as the work of the law-giver.†

The evidence thus far adduced is explicit and seemingly conclusive; but, before the case is closed, it should be subjected to a closer examination. If D really was written by Moses, and was known as his work at certain dates, it ought to bear marks of its Mosaic origin, and the other works written before it was lost, if it was lost, ought to bear traces of its influence. If the authors

* The Deuteronomic character of 2 Kgs. xxii. f. has already been discussed. For an earlier example in the same style, see 1 Kgs. ix. 1–9. The influence of the Deuteronomic idea of the centralization of worship at Jerusalem appears in the latter; but it is more apparent in 1 Kgs. xiv. 21, and the passages in which the commendation bestowed upon the good kings before Josiah is modified by the significant statement, "but the high places were not taken away," 1 Kgs. xv. 14; xxii. 43; etc.

† The passages in question are those cited (pp. 8 ff.) in proof of the claim that "the law of Moses" in the Former Prophets is Deuteronomy. They are Jos. i. 7 f.; viii. 31 f., 34; xxii. 5; xxiii. 6; Jud. iii. 4; 1 Kgs. ii. 3; viii. 53, 56; 2 Kgs. xiv. 6; xviii. 6, 12; xxi. 8.

who are known to have written before, according to the Deuteronomic historian, it *can* have been lost betray no knowledge of it, the testimony of the same historian to its Mosaic origin will justly be questioned; and if the internal evidence clearly contradicts him, while he is not to be rashly condemned as a falsifier, his statements on the point under discussion must be ignored. The first question is easily disposed of. Scholars are generally agreed that, while Jeremiah constantly reminds one of Deuteronomy, and most of the later writers to a greater or less degree betray its influence,* the genuine prophecies of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah leave no such impression.† Hence, 2 Kgs. xviii. 6 to the contrary notwithstanding, it is not probable that it was in existence when these prophets flourished.

The second question requires more extended treatment. The evidence derivable from Deuteronomy itself is of various kinds. In the first place, the book may be examined from the linguistic standpoint. The result of such an examination is unfavorable to the opinion that it belongs to the earliest period of Hebrew literature. The use of the word *prophet* is significant in this connection. It occurs nine times; yet 1 Sam. ix. 9 says that it is a comparatively late term, that the man of God was called a *seer* until after the establishment of the monarchy. The general style of the book should also be considered. It has not the freshness and picturesqueness of early Hebrew, but an oratorical breadth and diffuse-

* See Eze. xx.; Mal. iv. 4/iii. 22; Neh. i. 5 ff.; Dan. ix. 4 ff.; etc.

† On the passages by these prophets usually cited as evidence of their acquaintance with Deuteronomy, see Driver, *Deu.* lxii. f.; Riehm, *EAT*, i. 332 ff.; comp. Keil, *EAT*, i. 171 ff.; Green, *HCP*, 54 f.

ness, already noticed, which belongs to an advanced stage of literary development.* The local and historical indications agree with the linguistic. The phrase "beyond Jordan," in the use made of it, implies that the book, or the part of it in which this phrase occurs, was written, not in Moab, but in Canaan,† and the comparison "as Israel did to the land of his possession" (ii. 12), that it was penned after the Conquest.‡ If it be objected that ii. 10–12 and 20–22, and iii. 11 and 14–17, the last of which is later than the period of the Judges,§ are glosses, the same cannot be said of xvii. 14 ff. This law

* See Dillmann, *NDJ*, 611; Kittel, *HH*, i. 61 f.

† The expression *beyond* (Heb. בעבר), where it is supplemented by an explanatory clause denoting direction, may mean either side with reference to the speaker or writer. Thus supplemented, it is used of the same side, Jos. i. 15; v. 1; xii. 7; of the opposite, Deu. xi. 30; Jos. xii. 1; xiii. 8. When not modified by such a clause, in all cases, save one, in which its meaning can be ascertained from the context, it denotes the side opposite that, actual or assumed, of the speaker or writer. The examples of this sort are Deu. iii. 20, 25; Jos. ii. 10; vii. 7; ix. 10; xxii. 4; xxiv. 2, 8, 14; Jud. v. 17; xi. 18; Jer. xxv. 22. This being the case, while one can infer nothing with reference to the standpoint of the writer from Deu. iv. 41 ff. or Jos. ix. 1, it is fair to conclude from Deu. i. 1 and 5 that the author of the introduction of Deuteronomy, at least, wrote in western Palestine. See also Jud. x. 8 and 1 Sam. xxxi. 7. The exception above mentioned, Deu. iii. 8, without doubt a slip of the pen, confirms this conclusion. See farther, Ezr. viii. 36; Neh. ii. 9; iii. 7; 1 Kgs. v. 4/iv. 24; Isa. viii. 23/ix. 1; the last two of which were written in Babylonia.

‡ The interpretation which makes this passage refer to the conquest of the kingdoms of Sihon and Og (Keil) is, to say the least, unwarranted.

§ It embodies a tradition found in one form in Num. xxxii. 41, and in another in Jud. x. 3 ff. See also Jos. xiii. 30; 1 Kgs. iv. 13; 1 Chr. ii. 22 f. On the relation of these various passages, see Driver on Deu. iii. 14 ff., and Moore on Jud. x. 3 ff.

concerning the king is a part of the body of the book, and evidently Deuteronomic. But it is plain from 1 Sam. viii. f. that neither Samuel, nor the author (or authors) of these chapters, was acquainted with any such provision.* Hence it must be later than the account of Saul's election, which the most conservative scholars do not think of placing before the date of the division of the kingdom, about 930 B. C.† The law providing for a court of appeals at Jerusalem (xvii. 8 ff.) has been supposed to indicate that it is later than the reign of Jehoshaphat; but it is hardly fair, in view of the estimate now put upon the testimony of the Chronicler, to quote 2 Chr. xix. 5 ff. in support of this position. The passage should rather be explained as an echo of Deuteronomy. Of greater significance are iv. 19 and xvii. 3; for they seem to point to the time of Manasseh, by whom the worship of "the host of heaven" was revived, if not introduced. See 2 Kgs. xxi. 3. Compare, however, 2 Kgs. xvii. 16, where this is among the sins for which Israel was destroyed. Better evidence that the book is a product of the seventh century B. C. is found in its teachings. The doctrine concerning the prophet seems to require such a conclusion. The earliest prophets were men, not of words, but of deeds; and so great was their influence in the affairs of their times, that even kings (1 Sam. xvi. 4; 1 Kgs. xxi. 27) dreaded their displeasure. Amos and those who followed him were preachers. They threatened, indeed, but they did not undertake to insure the fulfilment of their own prophecies. Finally there arose a class of prophets who merely reflected the wishes of

* On the relation between this passage and Deuteronomy, see Driver, *ILOT*, 175 ff.; *Deu.* 212 f.; Budde, *RS*, 183 f.; comp. Wellhausen, *CH*, 243 ff.; *GI*, 259 ff.

† See Keil, *EAT*, i. 245 ff.

their more or less powerful patrons, and who, by thus encouraging the wicked in their offences, hastened the day of retribution. Now the prophet of Deuteronomy (xviii.) is a preacher. Moreover, he is expressly contrasted with the false prophet, and a test is suggested (*vv.* 21 f.) by which the one may be distinguished from the other. Hence this passage, and the document to which it belonged, is probably to be referred to the seventh century, when, as is known from the prophecies of Jeremiah, the distinction between the true and the false prophet needed emphasis.* The same result is reached if the doctrine of the centralization of worship be considered. The earlier prophets, although they speak of Jerusalem as the abode of Yahweh (Am. i. 2; Isa. viii. 18), do not require that all his worshippers shall pay homage to him in the temple erected by Solomon. They could not have done so; for, since the kingdom had been divided at the instigation of the prophet Ahijah (1 Kgs. xi. 30 f.), and the erection of a separate government implied the establishment of a distinct worship, the doctrine that Yahweh could be approached acceptably only at Jerusalem would have been an attack upon the divinely guaranteed independence of Israel, and, if taught within the kingdom, would justly have been punished as treason. When, however, the northern kingdom had been overthrown, and it had become possible to make Jerusalem the sole shrine of the Hebrew religion, Hezekiah, doubtless under Isaiah's direction,

* The earlier references to false prophets are Mic. iii. 5 ff. and Zph. iii. 4. Isa. ix. 15/14 is an interpolation. Jeremiah repeatedly refers to them, sometimes devoting long passages to polemics against them. See especially xiv. 13 ff.; xxiii. 15 ff.; xxvi. 4 ff.; xxvii. 9 ff.; and xxviii. 9 ff. In the last case the test suggested in Deuteronomy is applied.

took the first steps toward this end;* and seventy-five years later Josiah, in accordance with a book, in which meanwhile an unknown prophet (or prophets) had given to old material a form and setting adapted to the needs of his generation, succeeded for the time being in concentrating worship in the place which Jehovah had evidently chosen for his sanctuary. Thus, all the internal evidence obtainable points to the conclusion that the Deuteronomic document had its origin in the seventh century B. C., before the restoration of the temple by Josiah.

It is possible that this work is the one found by Hilkiah, but it cannot be identified with the book of Deuteronomy; for this latter is not the work of a single author. In the first place, as already noted, it contains various fragments from the other documents;† and secondly, in its more characteristic portions it gives evidence of having passed through the hands of at least one editor. The fewest changes and additions are found in chapters xii.–xxvi. These chapters, therefore, in their earliest form, have sometimes been identified with the original Deuteronomic document.‡ But the last verse of xxviii.

* See 2 Kgs. xviii. 4, 22. 2 Chr. xxx. 5 says that he sent his invitation to the passover with which he celebrated the reopening of the temple "from Beersheba even unto Dan."

† According to Driver (*ILOT*, 72) traces of the other documents are found only in chapters i., xxvii., and xxxi.–xxxiv.; but Bacon (*TTE*, 262) refers to E x. 6 f. and parts of xxv. 17–19. See also Holzinger, *EH*, ii. 10; Oxford *Hex.* ii. 246 ff.

‡ See Wellhausen, *CH*, 195. According to Cornill (*EAT*, 25), D consisted of xii. 1–xiii. 1 (in a shorter form); xiii. 2–19; xiv. 3, 21 aα*, 21b (?); xiv. 22–xv. 3; xv. 7–23; xvi. 1–8*, 9–20; xvi. 21–xvii. 7 (in a different connection); xvii. 8–13*; xviii. 1–13; xix. 1–15, 16–20*, 21; xx. (except 2–4 and 15–18); parts, no longer determinable, of xxi.–xxv.; xxvi. 1–15. See, farther, Holzinger, *EH*, 263 ff.

(69/ xxix. 1) was evidently meant to connect this chapter with them; and, in fact, they seem incomplete without it. There are similar reasons for believing that chapters v.–xi., in some form, belonged to the first edition. The title prefixed to them was undoubtedly intended to connect them with xii.–xxvi., and the points of likeness between the two parts seem to show that they belong together.* The relation between i.–iv. and the two following parts of the book is not so close as theirs to each other. These chapters, therefore, with the exception of the first verses of i. and the last of iv., are by many attributed to an editor or reviser. Driver, however (*Deu.*, lxvii.), defends the genuineness of i.–iii., and finds little difficulty in believing that iv. also is the work of the author of v. ff. The truth probably lies between these opposing views; for, while a good part of the chapters under consideration falls below the higher Deuteronomic standard, it is not true that the style and content are throughout inferior. In other words there is a mixture in them of two elements. The inferior passages are generally marked by the use of the plural of the second person, when Israel is addressed. Nor is this their only linguistic peculiarity.† Moreover, where the plural pronoun

* For a detailed discussion of the language and contents of v.–xi. as compared with xii.–xxvi., see Kuenen, *OCH*, 112 ff.; also Westphal, *SP*, ii. 105 ff.; Driver, *Deu.*, lxv. ff.; Mitchell, *JBL*, 1899, 69 f.

† Various words and expressions characteristic of the Deuteronomic style are either not used where they were to be expected, or used in senses more or less different from those in which they appear in other connections. On the other hand, these passages have some words and phrases rarely or never found except in them or in similar passages in other parts of the book. Thus, while the "covenant" of these passages is the one made at Horeb (iv. 13, 23; see also v. 2, 3, etc.), that of those in which the singular is used

prevails peculiar prominence is usually given to the events that transpired at Horeb, and peculiar hostility toward idolatry manifested.* These passages constitute the greater part of the first four chapters. Among them are interspersed others with the singular of the second person, in which both the style and the standpoint are genuinely Deuteronomic.† The latter, or most of them,

is the covenant with the fathers (iv. 31; see also vii. 9, 12, etc.). Compare, farther, "which . . . eyes have seen" (iv. 9; see also vii. 19; x. 21; etc.) with the singular, and "eyes have seen" (iii. 21; iv. 3; see also xi. 7), with the plural. Finally, four of the seven words and phrases quoted by Kuenen (*OCH*, 121) to prove that these chapters are not by the same author as v.–xxvi. are peculiar, not to these chapters as a whole, but only to the portions of them under consideration. (See especially the name *Amorite*, i. 7, 19, etc.); and the same is true of six of the eight terms supposed to betray the influence of P (Driver, *Deu.*, lxxi.). See farther, *JBL*, 1899, 71 ff.

* When merely alluding to the theophany, iv. 10, Moses uses the singular pronoun; so also *vv.* 33 and 36; but when he undertakes to describe it, *vv.* 11–14, the plural. This fact, however, might be overlooked, if, on returning to the subject in the ninth chapter, he did not again change numbers (*v.* 8), and use the plural to the end of his long (ix. 8–x. 5) account of the tables of the covenant. See also the framework of chapter v.; but comp. x. 10. The same is the case with the subject of idolatry. In iv. 19 the worship of the heavenly bodies is forbidden in the singular; but the four preceding verses, with their detailed prohibition of the use of images, have the plural. See also iv. 23, 25, 28; vi. 14; vii. 4 f., 25; ix. 12–21; xi. 16; xii. 2–4; xx. 18; xxviii. 14; xxix. 16/17 f., 24/25 f.; and note that the verses cited, or the longer passages to which they belong, generally have the marks of interpolations. Comp. viii. 19; xiii. 3/2, 7/6, 14/13 (?); xxviii. 36; xxx. 17.

† For examples of the literary character of this element, see ii. 7 and 25, but especially iv. 37–40. The tone and purpose of the latter passage are also to be noted, being precisely those found in vi. 4–13, and the other most characteristic portions of the book. The

are probably remnants of the original introduction to D, and the parts of xxvii., xxix., xxx., and xxxi. in the same style the remains of the conclusion of the document.*

The dimensions of the original document having thus been indicated, the question recurs, whether it was the book discovered by Hilkiah the priest; in other words, whether the changes which it finally underwent, or any of them, were made before its recognition as the law of Moses. The account of the reforms instituted upon its discovery indicates that it required, not only the centralization of the worship of Yahweh at the capital, on which

other passages in which the singular is used are only less strikingly Deuteronomic.

* Dillmann (*NDJ*, 378) objects to the genuineness of chapters xxix. and xxx. on the ground that they contain certain words and phrases not found elsewhere in Deuteronomy. The objection, however, holds against parts of xxix. only; for all but two of the twenty expressions cited are in this chapter, and, in fact, with one further exception, in the parts of it in which the second person is plural. Moreover, of the exceptions, one, נדח, is really Deuteronomic, occurring with the meaning *impel* — which it has in xxx. 17 — in xiii. 6/5, 11/10, and 14/13a, and in the sense *expel* — which it has in xxx. 1 and 4 — in xxii. 1; while the other, אלה, *oath*, *curse*, although it occurs six times in both chapters (xxix. 11/12, 13/14, 18/19, 19/20, 20/21; xxx. 7), is so variously used that it can hardly be pronounced characteristic. The further objections (Driver, *Deu.*, lxxiii. f.), that the connection in these chapters is sometimes imperfect, and that the standpoint in parts of them is different from that of the undoubted portions of the book, are likewise relieved by referring the disturbing element to a second author. Of course, no one who admits the genuineness of xxviii., or the substance of it, can reject xxx. 1–10 because, like iv. 30 f., it presents a prospect of return from captivity. A promise of this sort is the natural expression of faith in a future for the chosen people at any time after the overthrow of the kingdom of Israel. See Jer. xvi. 14. On the language of these final chapters see further *JBL*, 1899, 74 ff.

Deuteronomy is a unit, but also the utter extinction of the rival cults against which those parts of the present book where the plural of the second person is used were evidently directed.* It seems necessary, therefore, to conclude that the two elements of which Deuteronomy is mainly composed were united before the year 621 B. C.

How long before? is the next question. Many hold that the book reported found had its origin just before the date of its discovery (Reuss, *GAT*, 350 ff.; Kuenen, *OCH*, 214 ff.; Dillmann, *NDJ*, 613; etc.), and some that, in fact, Hilkiah had a hand in its preparation, or was in collusion with its author or authors. See especially Cornill, *EAT*, 30. But, in the first place, there is no proof that Hilkiah was playing a part in the matter, and, second, as W. R. Smith maintains (*OTJC*, 363), the fact that, according to 2 Kgs. xxiii. 9, "the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem" shows that neither he nor any of his colleagues could have dictated or indorsed Deu. xviii. 6–8, where express provision is made that the rural Levite, who comes to the central sanctuary for the purpose, "shall minister in the name of Yahweh his God." If, however, the book was actually found, the probabilities are that it was lost before Josiah came to the throne, and that, therefore, it had attained its actual dimensions in the reign of the wicked and idolatrous Manasseh.

The process by which it had become what it was when discovered, according to the latest theory, was that of compilation; a document, itself composite, whose author (670 B. C.), when freely writing, naturally used the

* On the first point, see 2 Kgs. xxiii. 21–23, where the first celebration of the passover at Jerusalem is described; and on the second, the passages already cited (pp. 9 f.) to show that the book found was some form of Deuteronomy.

plural of the second person in addresses to Israel, being wrought into an earlier compilation, whose author (690 B. C.) always employed the singular, by a redactor (650 B. C.), who added more or less as he proceeded.* But the general similarity of style and tone in the laws, in spite of the variety of their content, indicates that, with some exceptions, they were brought together by a single collector; while, on the other hand, the affinity between the additions attributed to the redactor and the supposed contributions of the author of the later of the documents used seem to justify the inference that the two writers were one.† In other words, it is probable that the book found by Hilkiah was a revised and enlarged edition, if one may use the term, of the work of the original Deuteronomist. Those portions of the present book which cannot be referred to one of these two sources must be attributed to later editors, compilers, or transcribers.

* This is the view of Steuernagel (*DJ*, vi. ff.), who thus distributes the material used by the redactor (*Deu.*, iv. ff.): —

Sg. — vi. 4 f., 10–13, 15; vii. 1–4a, 6, 9, 12b–16a, 17–21, 23 f.; viii. 2–5, 7–14, 17 f.; ix. 1–4a, 5–7a; x. 12, 14 f. 21, (22 ?); xi. 10–12, 14 f.; xii. 13 f., 16–20a, 21, 26 f.; xiv. 23aα, 24–27a, 28–29a; xv. 19 f.; xvi. 1 f., 5–7, 9–11, 13–15, 18*; xvii. 8*, 10b; xviii. 1 f.*, 3 f., 6, 8; xix. 2, 3b, 4–8a, 9b, 10*, 15–19 a*; xiii. 2/1–4/3a, 6/5–10/9 aα*, 11/10b, 13/12 f., 16/15–18/17; xx. 10–17aα, 19 f.; xxii. 1–4, 6–7a, 8; xxiii. 16 f.*, 20, 25 f.; xxiv. (6), 10–22; (xxv. 4); xv. 1 f., 7–15, 18; xxv. 1–3, 11–12a; xxvi. 2*, 5–15a; xxviii. 1–8a, 12–13a, 15–20*, 23–25a, 43–46; xxx. 14, 19b–20; xxxi. 9aα, 10, 11b.

Pl. — iv. 45; v. 1–4, 20/23–28/31; ix. 9, 11, 13–17, 21, 25–29; x. 1–5, 11, 16 f.; xi. 2–5, 7, 16 f., 22–28; xii. 1* (?), 8, 9*, 10 f., 12*; xvi. 21–xvii. 7, 8a*, 9*, 11–13*; xviii. 10–12a; xix. 3a, (3–7*), 11f., (14); xxi. 1–4, 6–8, 10–23; xxii. 5, 9–29; xxiii. 1–4, 8–15, 18 f., 22–24; xxiv. 1–5, 7; xxv. 5–10, 13–16a.

† On the first point see, *e. g.*, the use of the phrase "put away evil from thy midst," xiii. 6/5 (Steuernagel's Sg.); xvii. 7 (Steuernagel's Pl.); etc.: on the second, the condemnation of idolatry, vii. 5 and 25 (Steuernagel's R); ix. 13–17 (Pl.); etc.

There is no doubt about the relative age of D and the other prophetic documents. It is certainly, even in its original form, later than either of them ; for it is largely a reproduction of their contents. This indebtedness of D to J and E is most apparent in the legal portions of Deuteronomy ; some of its statutes being copied almost *verbatim* from the other documents,* while others are laws from J or E varied or expanded as they would naturally be by a fluent writer,† or modified to suit the conditions under which the Deuteronomic document originated.‡ The historical portions of Deuteronomy also betray the acquaintance of its authors with both the Yahwistic and the Elohistic narrative. It appears in various incidental allusions scattered through the book,§

* Examples: xiv. 21b (Ex. xxiii. 19b; xxxiv. 26b); xvi. 19b (Ex. xxiii. 8). See further Oxford *Hex.* i. 73 f.

† Examples: xvi. 9–15 (Ex. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22); xvii. 2–7 (Ex. xxii. 19/20); xxiii. 19/20 f. (Ex. xxii. 24/25).

‡ Deu. xv. 12–18 is a reproduction of Ex. xxi. 2–6, the object of which at first sight seems to be the inculcation of generosity toward released slaves; but the careful reader will notice that, according to Ex. xxi. 6, the ceremony prescribed is to take place at a sanctuary, while, according to Deu. xv. 7, the door at which the slave's ear is to be pierced is that of his master's dwelling; in other words, that the latter ignores the local sanctuaries recognized by the former. The hostility of the Deuteronomist to these old sanctuaries is still more apparent in xvi. 1–17, but especially in xix. 1–13. Comp. Ex. xxiii. 14–18; xxxiv. 18, 22 f.; xxi. 12–14. In the last passage 13b has been changed to prepare the reader for the Deuteronomic form of the law. See *v.* 14 and 1 Kgs. ii. 28. Thus, in one form or another, almost all the statutes of Ex. xxi.–xxiii., except those relating to damages, xxi. 18–xxii. 14/13, reappear in Deuteronomy. See Driver, *ILOT*, 73 ff.; also Oxford *Hex.* i. 75 f.

§ The following are some of them: i. 8 (Gen. xv. 18); iv. 3. (Num. xxv. 3); vi. 16 (Ex. xvii. 7); vii. 20 (Ex. xxiii. 28); viii. 3 (Ex. xvi. 15); viii. 15 (Num. xxi. 6; Ex. xvii. 6); ix. 22 (Num. xi. 3, 34);

but more clearly in the extended passages in which certain series of events are reviewed.* In these last the order of the events mentioned, as well as the phraseology of the references to them, is proof of dependence upon the parallel passages, partly Yahwistic and partly Elohistic, in the books of Exodus and Numbers.†

The dependence of D upon J and E, and therefore the priority of the last two to the first, is universally admitted. There is also general agreement to the effect that both J and E, in some form, are as early as, if not earlier than, the earliest of the prophets whose works have been preserved; this conclusion being based, not so much on unmistakable references to these documents,‡ as upon the relation of the ideas of their authors to those of Amos and his immediate successors. The relative date of J and E, on the other hand, is a question on which scholars are still divided. Dillmann and others, as has already been stated, hold to the priority of E;§ but the majority maintain that J is the earlier, and this, on the whole, is the more defensible position. In its favor is the fact that, in cases like Gen. xx. and xxvi. 7–11, in which the same

xi. 6 (Num. xvi. 1, 32); xiii. 4 (Ex. xiii. 4); xxiii. 4 (Num. xxii. 5); xxiv. 9 (Num. xii. 10); xxv. 17 (Ex. xvii. 8 ff.).

* Compare especially i. 19–45 with Num. xiii. f.; ii. 8b–iii. 7 with Num. xxi. 11b–35; and ix. 9–x. 10 with Ex. xxxii.–xxxiv.

† For a fuller discussion of this subject, see Oxford *Hex.* i. 70 ff.

‡ Kittel (*HH*, i. 82) cites the following passages from the writings of Amos and Hosea as proof that these prophets were acquainted with both J and E: Am. i. 11 (Gen. xxvii. 40, JE); ii. 9 (Num. xiii. 27 ff., JE); ii. 10 [Gen. xlviii. 22, E]; iv. 11 (Gen. xix. 25, J); Hos. ix. 10 (Num. xxv. 3, E); xii. 4/3a (Gen. xxv. 26a, E); xii. 4/3b, 5/4 (Gen. xxxii. 25 ff, J); xii. 13/12 (Gen. xxxi. 41, E; xxvii. 43, JE; xxix. 18 ff., E); xii. 14/13 [Deu. xxxiv. 10, E]: comp. Driver, *ILOT*, 123.

§ See Dillmann, *NDJ*, 628 ff.; Kittel, *HH*, i. 76.

story appears in different versions, J is generally simpler and more original than the other. A further indication that J in its primitive form is the earlier is found in the *naïveté* of the author's conceptions of God and his relations with men, as compared with those of the Elohistic narrator.* Thirdly, the code of Ex. xxi.–xxiii., which furnished the basis of D and probably originally came toward the end of E's account of the Exodus, marks a stage of progress in the production of a history of the Hebrews beyond that which had been reached when the Yahwistic document was written.† Finally, when these documents are examined separately with reference to their age, the evidence, as will presently appear, seems to make it necessary to conclude that J antedates E by at least half a century.

J is earlier than E, but J dates from a period considerably later than that of Moses. It furnished parts of the account of the death and burial of the law-giver in Deu. xxxiv. In Gen. xxxvi. 31 a list of the early kings of Edom, probably taken from it,‡ is introduced by the words: "These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before a king of the children of Israel ruled," *sc.* over that country. It is plain that these words could not have been written before the reign of David (2 Sam. viii.

* The doctrine, common to E with P, that the name *Yahweh* was unknown until the Exodus, is unmistakable evidence of a comparatively advanced stage of theological development. Compare, also, Gen. xxi. 17 f. with xvi. 7 f.; xxii. 11 f. with xviii. 13 f.; xxxi. 7–9 with xxx. 41 ff.; etc.

† Cornill (*EAT*, 37) compares the terms of the covenant in Ex. xxxiv. (J) with the ten commandments in xx. (E); but they are not parallels, the Elohistic analogue, as Bacon has shown (*TTE*, 112 f.; *JBL*, xii. 29 f.), being found in the fragments of another covenant in xx. 22–26, xxii. 28/29–30/31, and xxiii. 10–33.

‡ See Wellhausen, *CH*, 52; Bacon, *GG*, 184; etc.

14). Gen. ix. 25, xii. 6, and xiii. 7 are supposed to indicate a somewhat later date, since the Canaanites, etc., were not subdued until the reign of Solomon (1 Kgs. ix. 20 f.). These passages alone would hardly be a sufficient foundation for a statement concerning the date of the work in question; but there is further evidence. The fact, recognized by scholars of the most divergent views on other points, that the document was one of the sources, not only of the Pentateuch, but also of the book of Joshua,* if not of Judges, Samuel, and Kings,† proves that it cannot have been written before the Conquest; and the further circumstance that the author of it in Jos. x. 13 quotes from the "Book of Jashar" — a work to which belonged David's lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 18 ff.) and, according to the Septuagint (1 Kgs. viii. 53‡), a tetrastich by Solomon on the occasion of the dedication of the temple, — indicates that it originated some time after the beginning of the regal period. Nor is this all. This document, as well as E, expressly prohibits the use of symbols for the Deity (Ex. xxxiv. 17). If, however, such a prohibition was promulgated by Moses, is it

* The intimate relation of Joshua to the Pentateuch was first observed by Geddes (*HB*, i. xxi.). For characteristic passages from J, see xv. 14–19 and xvii. 14–18.

† Bleek (*Beiträge*), as has already been noted, was the first (1822) to clearly define the connection between Joshua and the Pentateuch. Later Stähelin (*KU*, 1843) applied the Supplementary Hypothesis to the other three books, and concluded that his Jehovist was the author, not only of the Hexateuch, but of the greater part of Judges and 1 Samuel. See also *EAT*, 93. Schrader (in de Wette's *Einleitung*, 359) asserts that the hand of the Yahwist (his "Prophetic Narrator") can be traced as far as 1 Kgs. x. Budde (*RS*) makes J one of the sources of Judges and Samuel, and Cornill formerly held that it entered into the composition even of 1 Kings. The latter, however, has abandoned this position (*EAT*, 93 f., 106).

‡ See Klostermann on 1 Kgs. viii. 12 f.

not strange that not only Micah and the Danites, in the unsettled period of the Judges, when "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jud. xvii. 5 f., 13; xviii. 5, 31), but David, the chosen of Yahweh, used the ephod — an image of some sort, and not a garment — and teraphim in their approaches to God unrebuked (1 Sam. xix. 13; xxi. 9; xxiii. 6, 9 ff.; xxx. 7 f.)? See also the case of Gideon (Jud. viii. 27a$^{\alpha}$).* These early records are best explained by supposing that the use of images was not absolutely prohibited until after the revolt of the northern tribes and the establishment of the sanctuary with a golden calf at Bethel (1 Kgs. xii. 28). There is therefore good ground for believing, with most scholars, that the Yahwistic document was written toward the middle of the ninth century B. C. The evident partiality of its author for the tribe and kingdom of Judah indicates that it had its origin in southern Palestine.†

E, on the other hand, was probably written in northern Palestine. At any rate, the author seems to have been particularly interested in the persons and places that would naturally appeal to a native of that region.‡ Its

* The rest of this verse is an addition to the text much later than the original story. See Moore, *i. l.*

† Instances of such partiality are: the association of Abraham especially with Hebron (Gen. xiii. 18; xviii. 1); the prominence given to Judah in the story of Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 26; xliii. 3 ff.; xliv. 18 ff.), and to his descendants in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 8 ff.) and the account of the conquest of Palestine (Jud. i. 1 ff.); and the fulness of the treatment of the reign of David (2 Sam.). Compare Kuenen, *OCH*, 248 ff., who holds that J in its original form was a product of the fuller literary and spiritual life of the northern kingdom.

‡ It is he who describes at length the rise of Joseph to power in Egypt (Gen. xl. f.), and foretells the greatness of his posterity (Deu. xxxiii. 13 ff.); who makes Reuben, rather than Judah, the spokesman among his brethren (Gen. xxxvii. 22; xlii. 22, 37); who

general features, as has already been shown, are such as to make the impression that it is later than J. It is not surprising, therefore, to meet indications of its real age in the Pentateuch ; * also to discover that it was a more extensive work than was at first suspected, that, in fact, it was a principal source in the compilation of the book of Joshua.† If, however, it is later than J and earlier than D, it seems safe to conclude that it was written about the beginning of the eighth century B. C., when, moreover, the conditions in Israel were peculiarly favorable to its production.

The first step in the compilation of the Pentateuch was the union of J and E into a single work. This, however, was not taken until both documents had undergone considerable changes in the way of enlargement and modification at the hand of more or less sympathetic revisers. The proof of this assertion is found in the slighter variations in style and content of certain passages from the body of the document in which they are now found incor-

notices the position and achievements of Joshua (Ex. xvii. 9 ff. ; xxxiii. 11 ; Deu. xxxi. 14) ; and who oftenest mentions the shrines dear to Israel, — Shechem (Gen. xxxiii. 18b), Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 17 f. ; xxxv. 1 ff.), and Beersheba (Gen. xxi. 31 ; xxii. 19 ; xlvi. 2–5a).

* The phrase "land of the Hebrews" in Gen. xl. 15 could hardly have been used before the occupation of Palestine ; the reference to the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh," Num. xxi. 14, implies that the Conquest was long past ; while the use of the term "prophet" in Gen. xx. 7, if 1 Sam. ix. 9 has any value, forbids one to place its date earlier than the tenth century B. C.

† The most important extract from E in this book is chapter xxiv. The Elohist, as well as the Yahwist, has been supposed to have contributed to the composition of the later histories, especially Judges and Samuel ; but in this, as in the other case, the evidence adduced has not proven satisfactory. See the authorities quoted with reference to the extent of the Yahwistic document.

porated. These additions were not, in the case of either document, all made at the same time. The older, which some regard as excerpts from independent narratives, are designated by J^2 or E^2; the later, by J^3 or E^3, etc.*

The date of the union of J and E into the whole usually designated by JE must be fixed with reference to D. There is little doubt that the first two were still separate when the original of the last was written, for D throughout gives evidence that, although its author was acquainted with both, he followed almost exclusively the later.† On the other hand, there is evidence that, when this document was revised and enlarged, the other two had already been united; for the author (or authors) of the additions in which the plural of the second person is habitually used follows neither J nor E, but a compilation such as has been preserved in the Pentateuch.‡ If, therefore, as has been shown, the book found by Hilkiah was D in its revised and enlarged form, and it had its origin before

* Among the passages referred to J^2 are Gen. iv. 3–16a, and the fragments of the Yahwistic account of the Flood preserved in Gen. vi.–viii.; among those credited to E^2, the story of the golden calf in Ex. xxxii. 1–6 and 15–24, and Num. xi. 16 f. and 24b–30. See Cornill, *EAT*, 39 ff., 43 f.

† A distinct trace of the influence of J is seen in the repeated references in D to the promise to the fathers. See vi. 10, etc. (Gen. xxiv. 7; etc.). An exception to the rule above stated is the law concerning the annual feasts, Deu. xvi. 1–17, which seems to betray dependence on J. See Ex. xiii. 4; xxxiv. 22 f., 25.

‡ See the story of the spies, Deu. i. 19–45, where *vv.* 24 f., 27, and 40–43 recall the parts of Num. xiii. f. (xiii. 23 f., 29; xiv. 25b, 39b–40) usually ascribed to E, while *vv.* 28–30, 32 f., 35 f. and 39 reflect the Yahwistic or editorial features (xiii. 28; xiv. 9b, 14; xiii. 30; xiv. 24, 3, 31) of the composite narrative; also Deu. ix. 9–x. 5 and the parallel passages in Ex. xxxii. (9 f. [JE], 15 [E], 19 [E], 20 [E], 11–14 [JE]), and xxxiv. (1–4 [J]). Compare Oxford *Hex.* i. 173 f.

Josiah began to reign, it follows that the compilation JE also must antedate 639 B. C.; but how much earlier it was made, there seems to be no means of determining.

The next step in the production of the Pentateuch was the insertion into JE of D in its revised and enlarged form. This would naturally follow soon after its publication; yet it is doubtful if it was accomplished much, if any, before the overthrow of the Jewish monarchy. The work was probably done by a second redactor, who made such changes and additions as seemed to him necessary to adapt it to his purpose.* It is supposed to have been inserted into the place formerly occupied by Ex. xxi.–xxiii., the latter being removed to its present position in the account of the sojourn at Sinai to make room for it. At the same time most of the Deuteronomic touches in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers were added † and the book of Joshua recast to furnish a proper conclusion to the resulting Hexateuch.‡

The date of the Priestly document also, as has been intimated, is in dispute; one party holding that it is one of the oldest, the other as stoutly maintaining that it is the latest, of the sources from which the Pentateuch was compiled. The former opinion is largely based on certain passages in Deuteronomy which are supposed to betray an acquaintance with P; but it will be found upon

* One cannot otherwise explain the divergences that occur, especially in the first and the last chapters of the present book, where the plural is employed. Some of these passages, however, are doubtless of still later origin.

† On the Deuteronomic element in these books, see p. 23.

‡ Compare Kittel (*HH*, i. 75 f.), who holds that D was united with J and E when the last two were united with each other, and that the compiler of this threefold work was the author of the additions to Deuteronomy and Joshua. Dillmann (*NDJ*, 677 ff.), on the other hand, claims that the third document was not D, but P.

investigation that the passages usually cited, if they belong to the original document, have not the significance attributed to them, and if they really indicate dependence upon P, they are later additions to the work.* The majority of critical scholars, therefore, regard P as a product of Exilic and post-Exilic times. This view is supported by a variety of evidence. In the first place, a comparison of P with J, E, and D shows that it was written by a person (or persons) acquainted with them; that, in fact, it is the final product of a process of development of which they mark the previous stages. Its relative lateness is attested by its general features, the maturity displayed in its plan and its ideas. It appears also in a multitude of particulars, especially the legislative parallels between it and E and D. Take, *e. g.*, the law of asylum. It is first found, doubtless in its original form, in Ex. xxi. 12 ff., where it takes but three verses. It is repeated with additions in Num. xxxv. 9 ff., and again in Deu. xix. 1 ff.; but the extent and character of the additions in the former of the last two passages show that the order of their origin has been reversed, that the one in Numbers, and not the one in Deuteronomy, is the final form of the law in question.

The result of the comparison of P with the other documents is confirmed from other directions; first by the silence of the history of the pre-Exilic period with reference to it and its peculiar features. The tabernacle,†

* Thus, the three passages most frequently cited, i. 23, xiv. 4 ff., and xxiv. 8, are all either wholly or partly of a secondary character. Moreover, i. 23 was not derived from Num. xiii. 2–15, as is shown by the omission of Joshua from *v.* 36; xiv. 4 ff. is an un-Deuteronomic interpolation; and xxiv. 8 betrays a sacerdotal origin or expansion.

† In 1 Sam. ii. 22 the latter part of the verse is an interpolation not found in the Greek Version; and in 1 Kgs. viii. 4 the tent in

the high priest, the day of atonement, and other like objects and institutions seem to have been unknown during this whole period.* The testimony of the pre-Exilic prophets is even stronger; for they express themselves respecting the matters with which this document is most concerned in such terms as prove that, although the movement which produced it was already under way, the document itself had not yet made its appearance. Thus, Amos (v. 21 ff.) and Isaiah (i. 10 ff.) both disparage feasts and offerings as they would not have done had P already been recognized as the law of God; and Jeremiah, himself a priest as well as a prophet, says expressly (vii. 22) that God gave the fathers, when he delivered them from Egypt, no command concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. The last passage is doubtless to be interpreted in the light of Jer. viii. 8, where the prophet accuses the scribes of his time of dealing falsely with the law of Yahweh. The two seem to show that, when Jeremiah wrote, laws such as now constitute a large part of the priestly document were in process of codification, but that the prophet, at any rate, did not regard them as of divine, or even Mosaic origin. The testimony of Ezekiel is to the same effect. His prophecies, when examined in the light of the contents of P, show that, while there is an element in the latter which apparently antedates the former, there are parts of the document which betray the dependence of their author (or authors) upon Ezekiel, and that, therefore, the document as a whole must be referred to a period

question is the tent provided for the ark by David, and not, as it is called, "the tent of meeting" described in Exodus.

* See Wellhausen, *GI*, 40 ff., 153 ff., 112 ff.; W. R. Smith, *OTJC*, 254 ff.; comp. Green, *MP*, 85 ff.; *Lex Mosaica* (French), 133 ff.

subsequent to that in which the prophet labored.* Haggai, also, and the authors of Zch. i.–viii. and Malachi, seem to ignore it; which indicates that it was unknown in Palestine until some time after the beginning of the fifth century B. C.†

The *terminus ad quem* is more easily and satisfactorily determined. In the year 458 B. C., according to Ezr. vii., Ezra, "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," came from Babylon to Jerusalem "to teach in Israel statutes and judgments." At first his countrymen received him with favor, even with enthusiasm, but their ardor seems to have been short-lived. At any rate, it was fourteen years before, with the assistance of Nehemiah, he persuaded them to recognize the divine authority of the law that he had brought with him. Finally, however, in 444 he accomplished his purpose, and "the law of Moses" became the code of the restored community. But this law, according to Neh. viii. 14, contained, among other things, the instructions concerning the celebration of the

* The relative age of Ezekiel and the above-mentioned elements of P is indicated by their respective views on the subject of the priests and the Levites. In Lev. xvii.–xxvi. and the other passages of like character no distinction between priests and Levites, unless it has been interpolated, appears. Ezekiel first makes such a distinction (xliv.); but he has no high priest. In the body of P the priesthood is the exclusive possession of the sons of Aaron (Num. xviii. 1 ff.), with Aaron himself, and his eldest son after him, in a princely position at their head (Num. xvii.; xx. 22 ff.). See Wellhausen, *GI*, 126 ff.; Kuenen, *OCH*, 293 ff.; W. R. Smith, *OTJC*, 374 f.; Oxford *Hex.* i. 127 f.; comp. Green, *MP*, 127 ff.; *Lex Mosaica* (Spencer), 510 ff.

† Kuenen (*OCH*, 179 ff.) agrees with the above statement so far as it concerns Haggai and Zechariah, but he finds references to Lev. xxii. 20 ff. and Num. xviii. 21 ff. in Mal. i. 8 and iii. 10. See also Holzinger, *EH*, 428; comp. Cornill, *EAT*, 52 f.; Nowack, on Mal. iii. 22/iv. 4.

feast of tabernacles found in Lev. xxiii. 39 ff.;* hence it must either have been, or contained, some form of P. In either case this document cannot be later than the date just mentioned.

It is difficult to decide whether the law promulgated by Ezra and Nehemiah was P alone or the completed Pentateuch. In favor of the former view is its harmony with the accepted theory with reference to the history of D. It seems natural that this document, like the other, should have become a part of the growing compilation only after having been solemnly recognized as divinely authoritative. Moreover, there seems to be a discrepancy between the law of Ex. xxx. 11 ff. and the rule which, according to Neh. x. 32, was adopted by the restored community. It is objected, however, that, if the law in question had been P, the account of the conquest of Canaan preserved in the book of Joshua, with which it originally ended, would not afterward have been detached from it, as it has been, and classed with the less sacred books that follow it.† Moreover, some of the requirements of Neh. x. 28 ff. betray regard for J or D rather than for P,‡ and the author (or authors) of the Chronicles, of which the books of Ezra and Nehemiah were originally parts, throughout takes for granted the identity of the law of Moses with the Pentateuch. Hence, it seems safest to conclude that, if there is any foundation for Neh. viii. 1 ff., P had been incorporated with JED, and the book of Joshua detached from the resulting Hexa-

* See also x. 34/33 (Lev. xxiv. 5 ff.; Num. xxviii. f.), 35/34 (Num. iii. 5 ff.; Lev. vi. 12 f.), 36/35 (Lev. xix. 23 f.), 38/37 (Num. xv. 20 f.; xviii. 24), 39/38 (Num. xviii. 25 ff.).

† See Wellhausen, *IJG*, 136.

‡ See Neh. x. 31/30 (Ex. xxxiv. 16; Deu. vii. 3), 32/31 (Ex. xxiii. 10 f.; Deu. xv. 1 f.); note, also the Deuteronomic phraseology of *v.* 30/29.

teuch, before 458, or, at the latest, 444 ; * in other words, that it was the Pentateuch in its fourfold composition to which the Jews in their assembly pledged obedience, the occasional passages betraying a later date being interpolations by more or less competent readers or copyists. Comp. Oxford *Hex.* i. 138 ff.†

The conclusion reached with respect to the age of the Pentateuch, then, is, that J originated about 850, and E about 800 B. C. ; that the two, having been more or less revised and enlarged, were united into a composite document before 639 B. C. ; that D, which was discovered in 621 B. C., but must have been written some time before and revised in the reign of Manasseh, was incorporated with JE early in the Captivity ; and that the Pentateuch was practically completed by the addition of P, a product of the first half of the fifth century B. C., before 444, if not before 458, the date of Ezra's appearance in Palestine.‡

* According to Kosters (*HIPT*), who removes Neh. vii. 6–viii. 18 to the end of the book, the promulgation of the Law did not take place until Nehemiah's second visit to Jerusalem about 432 B. C. Comp. Torrey, *EN*, 2 f., 49 f.

† In reply to the objection (Holzinger, *EH*, 430 f.) that, if the book had been the Pentateuch, the reader would not have reached Lev. xxiii. on the second day (Neh. viii. 13 f.), one might retort that, if it had been P, the reading of it would not have required ten days (Neh. ix. 3). One might add that there is nothing in the account of the matter to make it necessary to insist that the book in question was read in course.

‡ It has sometimes been pronounced "a thing incredible" that the Pentateuch should be such a patchwork as the documentary hypothesis makes it. Fortunately there are other examples of compilation, one of which is quite as elaborate as this is supposed to be. It is the "Diatessaron," or fourfold Gospel, of Tatian, which at one time had nearly supplanted the originals in the Syrian Church. The following is a specimen quoted from the Arabic

The dates given, it will be observed, are the dates when the documents as such are believed to have originated, and when the Pentateuch as a compilation reached the various stages in its development. They do not, except in the cases in which the later documents can be shown to reproduce the earlier, indicate the age of the materials of which the documents are composed. These materials, in the case of J and E, were probably to some extent derived from oral tradition; but there is good evidence that the authors of these two works, as well as those of D and P, had written sources at their disposal. In certain instances they confess their indebtedness to

version of it by Professor Moore (*JBL*, ix. 207 ff.). The three kinds of type indicate the three sources, Mark, Luke, and Matthew, from which it was compiled: —

"**And the same day, when even was come, he said unto them,** Let us go unto the other side of the lake. **And when they had sent away the multitude** [Jesus] went into a ship with his disciples; **and there were also with him other little ships.** *And behold there arose a great tempest in the sea*, and the ships were near being swamped by the waves; **and** [Jesus] **was in the stern asleep on a pillow.** *And his disciples came to him and awoke him, saying, Master, save us, we perish!* Then he arose and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water, **and said unto the sea, Peace, be still! and the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. And he said unto them, Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith? And they feared exceedingly** [and] wondered, saying one to another, What manner of man is this? for he commandeth even the winds and water, and they obey him" (Mar. iv. 35a; Lu. viii. 22b; Mar. iv. 36a; Lu. viii. 22a; Mar. iv. 36b; Mat. viii. 24a; Lu. viii. 23b; Mar. iv. 38a; Mat. viii. 25; Lu. viii. 24b; Mar. iv. 39b–41a; Lu. viii. 25b).

This passage consists of *twelve* fragments, only *two* of which contain a whole verse. There is probably in the Pentateuch no passage in which the critics would claim that the supposed editor (or editors) treated his documents with greater freedom. For other examples of compilation, see Oxford *Hex.* i. 4 ff.

such sources. Thus, although they differ on the form of the covenant made at Sinai-Horeb, they agree in representing it as a written document the contents of which they reproduce. They both also quote from various national songs. In one instance (Num. xxi. 14), it will be remembered, the Elohist names the source, the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh," from which the lines quoted are taken. The Yahwist does not inform the reader where he found the poetical extracts in the earlier parts of his narrative; but the fact that, later in the work, he cites the "Book of Jasher" (Jos. x. 13) seems to warrant one in supposing that the earlier quotations are from the same or some other written source. The words of the covenant, according to J (Ex. xxxiv. 28), were put into writing by Moses; so, also, according to E (Ex. xxiv. 3), the judgments revealed to the lawgiver at Horeb.* Now it is not possible to apply these statements to the covenant and the judgments in the form in which they appear in Exodus xxxiv. 10–26 and xx. 22–xxiii. 33; † but, since there can be no doubt that Moses was the actual founder of the Hebrew church and commonwealth, it is safe to assume that he gave his people in writing the simpler precepts and regulations from which were developed, first the legislation ascribed to him in J and E, and finally the more elaborate codes of D and P. He may also, as Ex. xvii. 14 has been supposed to teach that he did, have made a record of the leading incidents of the

* Deu. xxvii. 8, if it belongs to E (Bacon), also refers to these judgments and implies that they had been put into writing by Moses.

† The principal reasons for this statement are, that these passages are not homogeneous wholes, and that they contain elements clearly of a later date than that of the Exodus. See Driver, *ILOT*, 35 f., 39 f.; Cornill, *EAT*, 66 ff.; W. R. Smith, *OTJC*, 337 ff.; Kittel, *HH*, i. 235 f.

Exodus ; but it is quite as probable that the memory of them was preserved in popular songs like that of Ex. xv. and those collected in the "Book of Jasher" and the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh." As the ideas and principles taught by Moses were developed, it was natural that the resulting codes, one after another, should be called by his name; and, when they were all finally incorporated into a history of the period which closed with the Exodus, that he should be credited with writing this great work as well as performing the great deeds which it especially commemorates.*

The outcome, then, of the investigation undertaken is, that, although in parts of the Bible the Pentateuch is attributed to Moses, and such was for centuries the teaching of the Christian as well as the Jewish church, the doctrine is based upon a mistaken tradition; the truth being that this so-called "law of Moses" is a composite work, the growth of the entire period from Moses to Ezra. This conclusion, being based upon the best of evidence, will have to be accepted, however it may affect the authority of the Pentateuch or the renown of its supposed author. As a matter of fact it ought not to diminish either. In the church of S. Pietro in Vincoli at Rome is the famous statue of the Hebrew lawgiver. It is a magnificent work of art, and at first one is glad that it is placed where its minutest details can conveniently be examined. Soon, however, the spectator with some artistic judgment begins to be disturbed in his enjoyment. There seems to be something wrong about the masterpiece. Its grandeur is so obtrusive that it becomes oppressive. He turns to his guidebook and there finds an explanation for the effect produced upon him. The statue, it appears,

* For further illustrations of the process here described, see W. R. Smith, *OTJC*, 383 ff.

was not made for the place which it now occupies, but was to have formed part of a colossal monument in the largest of the world's cathedrals. Suppose, now, that some great artist should carry out the original plan of Michael Angelo, complete the memorial to Julius II., and add it to the attractions of S. Pietro in Vaticano. Would any one with any taste probably object to such a consummation? One might at first miss the sharpness of outline which now forces itself upon the beholder, and feel a little confused by the thirty other statues belonging to the design for the mausoleum; but the genius of the greatest of modern sculptors is a guarantee that in the end both the artist and his work would receive increased admiration. What might be done for the Moses of art the biblical scholars of the last half century have done for the Moses of history. They have deprived him, indeed, of the lesser honor of having written a great work at the dictation of the Deity; but, in associating with him the succession of writers by whom the Pentateuch was actually composed and compiled, they have given him the preëminence, as the inspired founder of a nation and its religion, for which his God designed him. Moreover, those whose eyes are open to "behold wondrous things" out of the Scriptures say of the process now revealed, as devoutly as they ever did of the one by which they formerly believed the Pentateuch to have been produced,

> "This is from Yahweh,
> And it is marvellous in our eyes."

ANALYSIS OF GENESIS I.–XI.

The Documentary Hypothesis is based on known facts with reference to the structure and content of the Pentateuch. It ought, therefore, to explain them. It does explain the great mass of them to most of those competent to decide in such matters, and this is the reason for its prevalence in the scholarly world. Its most ardent advocate, however, would hardly claim that it is absolutely perfect. He would doubtless admit that, at this distance from the period of the origin of the Pentateuch, it is too much to expect to be able to unravel to the last thread the history of its compilation, and that, therefore, one must not be surprised if the accepted theory is not applicable without exceptions.

The limitations confessed, as well as the merits of the hypothesis, are fairly illustrated in the first eleven chapters of Genesis. The composite character of these chapters has been established. See pp. 16 ff. The separation of the Priestly from the other elements therein contained is easy. The first account of creation (i. 1–ii. 3) is plainly of this character. It is equally clear that this account was originally immediately followed by chapter v. (except *v.* 29), and that by an account of the Flood which seems to have been preserved entire in vi. 9–22; vii. 6, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; viii. 1–2a, 3b–5, 13a, 14–19; ix. 1–17, 28 f. The fourth chapter of this work is found distributed through the tenth of the canonical Genesis (*vv.* 1a, 2–4a, 5–7, 20, 22 f., 31 f.); the fifth, as a continuous whole, in xi. 10–26; and the sixth, or a part of it, in xi.

27 and 31 f. These passages, when read continuously, produce the impression that they were written, substantially as they have been preserved, for one another and by the same hand.

When they have been removed, there remains a series of Yahwistic passages the discrepancies among which make it necessary to pronounce them the product of two or more authors, but do not make it possible in every case to determine by which of the supposed authors a given passage was written. It is pretty generally agreed that the following passages belong to J^1, the earliest stratum of the Yahwistic component of the Pentateuch: iv. 16b–24; vi. 1 f., 4; ix. 20–27; and xi. 1–9. There is similar unanimity in referring the story of the Flood interwoven with that of the Priestly narrator in vi. 5–ix. 19, and the Yahwistic table of nations in chapter x., in their original form, to J^2; also xi. 28–30. There remain two extended passages, ii. 4b–iii. 24, in its original form, and iv. 2–16a, the former of which has hitherto generally been attributed to J^1, the latter to a third author, perhaps the compiler who put J^1 and J^2 together. This is the view adopted in the following pages; but Holzinger (*Genesis*, xxv.), *e.g.*, treats both as excerpts from J^1, while Kautzsch (*LOT*, 226) refers them to J^2. The discrepancies among the passages which Holzinger assigns to J^1 suggest to him the question, — which must have occurred to others, and certainly deserves consideration, — "whether it would not be more correct to suppose that the main stream of the Yahwistic history of primitive times (J^2) has not been enriched by the incorporation of other (older) legends of very various origin, which had never previously been brought into organic connection" (*Genesis*, 122). Stade (*ZAW*, 1894, 275 ff.) meets the same difficulty by supposing the Yahwistic account of the

Flood to have been incorporated into a previous compilation, consisting of J^a (ii. 4a–iii. 24* and xi. 1–9) united with J^b (iv. 25 f., 17 ff., and ix. 20 ff.; perhaps also x. 9 and vi. 1 f.) by an editor who also inserted the story (already long current) of Ḳayin and Hebhel.* It will be observed that, although the authors cited differ in their analysis of the remains of the Yahwistic document so-called, they agree that there was such an independent work, and that it was a compilation. The extent and character of the additions made by its compiler and the one who afterwards incorporated it with P, also later glossators, may be learned from the translation. On x. 8–12, see the comments.

The object of the foregoing analysis was to discover the sources of the chapters to be studied. If, now, they be examined with reference to their content, the result will be more satisfactory; for, in spite of the fact that they were compiled from various documents, they possess a certain unity and unfold in accordance with an intelligible plan. This plan is a modification of that of the Priestly document, the author of which is one of the most logical of the writers whose works are preserved in the Old Testament. An idea of the skill with which the compiler managed the materials at his disposal may be gathered, in advance of a more thorough study of the chapters themselves, from the following table of topics therein treated:

I. The World before Abraham, i.–xi.
  1. The Origin of Things, i.–iii.
    a. The Work of God, i.–ii.

* From this point onward, proper names, except in quotations from other authors, will appear in forms indicating with approximating exactness their Hebrew pronunciation. For a key to the transliteration, see the Preface.

(1) The First Account, i. 1–ii. 3.
(a) The First Day, i. 1–5.
(b) The Second Day, *vv.* 6–8.
(c) The Third Day, *vv.* 9–13.
(d) The Fourth Day, *vv.* 14–20.
(e) The Fifth Day, *vv.* 21–23.
(f) The Sixth Day, *vv.* 24–31.
(g) The Seventh Day, ii. 1–3.
(2) The Second Account, ii. 4–25.
(a) The Formation of Man, *vv.* 4–7.
(b) The Garden in 'Edhen, *vv.* 8–17.
(c) The Advent of Woman, *vv.* 18–25.
b. The Origin of Evil, iii.
(1) The First Disobedience, *vv.* 1–7.
(2) The Consequences of Disobedience, *vv.* 8–21.
(3) Expulsion from Paradise, *vv.* 22–24.
2. Early Growth and Corruption, iv. 1–vi. 8.
a. The Line of Ḳayin, iv. 1–24.
(1) The First Murder, *vv.* 1–16.
(a) A Rejected Offering, *vv.* 1–7.
(b) The Offerer's Resentment, *vv.* 8–16.
(2) The Earliest Civilization, *vv.* 17–24.
b. The Line of Sheth, iv. 25–v. 32.
(1) A Genealogical Fragment, iv. 25 f.
(2) The Complete Geneaolgy, v.
c. The Apostate Sons of God, vi. 1–8.
3. Noaḥ and his Times, vi. 9–ix. 29.
a. The Deluge, vi. 9–ix. 17.
(1) The Preparations of Noaḥ, vi. 9–vii. 5.
(a) The First Account, vi. 9–22.
(b) The Second Account, vii. 1–5.
(2) The Water of the Flood, vii. 6–viii. 14.
(a) A Destructive Prevalence, vii. 6–24.
(b) A Gradual Subsidence, viii. 14.
(3) The Future of the Survivors, viii. 15–ix. 17.
(a) Noaḥ's Offering, viii. 15–22.
(b) The Sacredness of Life, ix. 1–7.
(c) God's Bow, *vv.* 8–17.
b. Noaḥ's Prophecy, *vv.* 18–29.
4. The Origin of the Peoples, x.–xi.

a. The Race and its Divisions, x. 1–xi. 9.
  (1) A Gradual Dispersion, x.
    (a) The Families of Yepheth, *vv.* 1–5.
    (b) The Families of Ḥam, *vv.* 6–20.
    (c) The Families of Shem, *vv.* 21–32.
  (2) The Confusion of Tongues, xi. 1–9.
b. The Line of Shem, xi. 10–26.
c. The Family of Teraḥ, *vv.* 27–32.

THE WORLD BEFORE ABRAHAM

I. Translation *

1, a (1) (a) [1.1] In the beginning God created heaven and earth. [2] Now the earth was waste and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep; but the spirit of God brooded over the face of the water. [3] Then God said, Let there be light; and there was light; [4] and God saw that the light was good. God also separated the light from the darkness; and God called the light Day, while the darkness he called Night. [5] So it became evening, then became morning, one day.

(b) [6] Then God said, Let there be an expanse in the middle of the water, that it may make a division in the water; and † so † it † was. † [7] Thus God made the expanse, and it‡ separated the water that was under the expanse from the water that was above the expanse. [8] God also called the expanse Heaven: [and God saw that it was good].§ So it became evening, then became morning, a second day.

(c) [9] Then God said, Let the water under heaven gather itself into one mass,‖ that dry ground ¶ may

* The sources of the text are indicated by difference of type: the Roman being used for passages from P and additions betraying a similar style or standpoint, and the Antique for the Yahwistic elements. Omissions supplied are enclosed in brackets.

† Gr.; the Massoretic text has this clause at the end of *v.* 7.

‡ Syr.; text, *God.*

§ Gr.

‖ Gr.; text, *place.*

¶ Text, *the dry ground.*

appear; and so it was. 10 [Thus the water under heaven gathered itself together into its mass, and dry ground appeared].* God also called the dry ground Land, and the mass of water he called Sea: and God saw that it was good. 11 Moreover, God said, Let the land put forth vegetation: herb yielding seed [after its kind, and]† tree ‡ bearing fruit, wherein is its seed, after § its § kind § on the earth; and so it was. 12 Thus the land put forth‖ vegetation: herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit, whose seed is in itself, after its kind; and God saw that it was good. 13 So it became evening, then became morning, a third day.

(d) 14 Then God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven to distinguish between day and night. Let them also be signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; 15 and let them be lights in the expanse of heaven, to shed light upon the earth: and so it was. 16 Thus God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule day, and the lesser light to rule night; also the stars. 17 And God placed them in the expanse of heaven, to shed light upon the earth, 18 as well as to rule over day and over night, and to distinguish between light and darkness; and God saw that it was good. 19 So it became evening, then became morning, a fourth day.

(e) 20 Then God said, Let the water swarm with abundant living creatures, and let birds fly over the earth, across the expanse of heaven; [and so it was].¶ 21 Thus God created the great monsters, and all the living, moving creatures with which the water swarms after their kinds, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. 22 God also blessed them, saying,

* Gr. † Gr. ‡ Text, *fruit-tree.*
§ Gr.; the Massoretic text inserts this clause after *fruit.*
‖ Text, *caused to go forth.* ¶ Gr.

Increase and multiply, that ye may fill the water in the sea; and let the birds multiply on the land. 23 So it became evening, then became morning, a fifth day.

(f) 24 Then God said, Let the land produce living creatures after their kinds; cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth, after their kinds: and so it was. 25 Thus God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and all the creeping things of the ground after their kind: and God saw that it was good. 26 Moreover, God said, Let us make men in our image [and] * after our likeness, that they may exercise lordship over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of heaven, and over the cattle, and over all [the beasts of] † the earth, and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth. 27 Thus God created men in his own image; in the image of God created he them: male and female created he them. 28 God also blessed them, and God said to them, Increase and multiply, that ye may fill the earth and subdue it, and exercise lordship over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of heaven, [and over the cattle],‡ and over all the beasts [of the earth, and over all the creeping things],§ that creep on the earth. 29 God said also, Lo, I give to you every herb yielding seed that is on the face of the whole earth, and every ‖ tree ‖ in which is fruit ¶ yielding seed; yours shall it be for food: 30 and to all the beasts of the earth, and to all the birds of heaven, and to all [the creeping things] ** creeping on the earth, in which is a living soul, [give I] every green herb for food; and so it was. 31 And when God beheld all that he had made, lo, it was very good. So it became evening, then became morning, a †† sixth day.

* Gr. Sam. Vul. † Syr. ‡ Gr. Syr. § Gr.
‖ Sam.; text, *all the trees.* ¶ Gr.; text, *fruit of a tree.*
** Gr. †† Text, *the.*

(g) ii. 1 Thus heaven and earth were finished, and all their host. 2 When therefore God, on the seventh day, had put an end to the work that he had done, he rested on the seventh day from all the work that he had done. 3 God also blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it, because on it he rested from all the creative work that he, God, had done.

(2) (a) 4 These are the generations of heaven and earth, when they were created. **At the time when Yahweh God made earth and heaven,** 5 **no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up; for Yahweh God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there were no men to till the ground.** 6 **But a mist rose from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.** 7 **Yahweh God also formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Thus man became a living creature.**

(b) 8 **Then Yahweh God planted a garden in 'Edhen, eastward, and placed there the man that he had formed.** 9 **Yahweh God also caused to spring from the ground every tree pleasant to sight and good for food; also** the tree of life **in the middle of the garden** and **the tree of knowledge of good and evil.** 10 **Now** there went forth from 'Edhen a river watering the garden; and thence it branched and became four sources. 11 The name of the first is Pishon. It is the one that boundeth the whole land of Ḥawilah, where there is gold. 12 Moreover, the gold of that land is [very]* good. There is bdellium and the onyx. 13 And the name of the second river is Gihon. It is the one that boundeth the whole land of Kush. 14 And the name of the third river is Ḥiddeḳel. It is the one that floweth east of 'Asshur. And the fourth river is the Perath. 15 Yahweh God

* Sam.

also took the man and placed him in the garden of 'Edhen, to till and guard it. [16] **Moreover, Yahweh God charged the man, saying, From all the trees of the garden thou mayst eat,** [17] **except the tree** of knowledge of good and evil: **from it thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou eatest from it thou shalt surely die.**

(c) [18] **Then said Yahweh God, It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make him a helper suited to him.** [19] **Thereupon Yahweh God** [further] * **formed from the ground** [all the cattle, and] **all the beasts of the field, and all the birds of heaven, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatsoever the man called each** living creature, **that was its name.** [20] **Thus the man gave names to all the cattle, and** [all] † **the birds of heaven, and all the beasts of the field; but for himself the** ‡ **man** ‡ **found not a helper suited to him.** [21] **Then Yahweh God let fall upon the man a stupor, and he fell asleep; whereupon he took one of his ribs, closing up its place with flesh.** [22] **And Yahweh God fashioned the rib that he had taken from the man into a woman, and brought her to the man.** [23] **Then said the man, This, now, is one of my bones and a part of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because from** [her] § **man she was taken.** [24] **Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and cleave to his wife, and the** [two] ‖ **become one flesh.** [25] **And they were both naked, the man and his wife, yet they felt no shame.**

b (1) [iii. 1] **Now the serpent was most cunning of all the beasts of the field that Yahweh God had made. [The serpent]** ¶ **therefore said to the woman,**

* Gr. Sam.
‡ Gr.; text, *a man* or *'Adham*.
‖ Gr. Syr. Vul.
† Gr. Syr. Vul.
§ Gr. Sam.
¶ Gr. Syr.

Hath God, then, said, Ye shall not eat from any tree of the garden? 2 But the woman said, From the fruit of [all]* the trees of the garden we may eat, 3 except that of the fruit of this † tree that is in the middle of the garden God hath said, Ye shall not eat from it, nor shall ye touch it, lest ye die. 4 Then said the serpent to the woman, Ye will not surely die; 5 for God knoweth that, in the day ye eat from it, your eyes will be opened and ye will be like God, knowing good and evil. 6 Now when the woman saw that the tree was good for food and a delight to the eyes, also that the tree was desirable to make one wise, she took from its fruit and ate: she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate. 7 Thereupon the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; so they sewed together fig leaves and made themselves aprons.

(2) **8 But when they heard Yahweh God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, the man and his wife hid themselves from the face of Yahweh God among the trees of the garden. 9 Yahweh God therefore called the man, saying to him, Where art thou? 10 and he said, I heard thee in the garden and I became afraid, because I was naked, and hid myself. 11 But he said, Who told thee thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten from the tree from which I commanded thee not to eat? 12 And the man said, The woman thou placedst with me, she gave me from the tree, and I ate. 13 Thereupon Yahweh God said to the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I ate. 14 Then said Yahweh God to the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed shalt thou be above**

* Gr. Syr. † Sam.; text, *the*.

all the cattle and all the other beasts of the field. On thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat, all the days of thy life. [15] I will also set enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy offspring and her offspring; they shall bruise thee in the head, and thou shalt wound them in the heel. [16] To the woman [also] * he said, I will send thee labor very sore, even thy pregnancy; with labor shalt thou bear children. Moreover, toward thy husband shall be thy longing, and he shall rule over thee. [17] But to the † man † he said, Because thou hast listened to the voice of thy wife, and eaten from the tree concerning which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat from it, cursed shall be the ground on thy account; with labor shalt thou eat from it all the days of thy life. [18] Thorns also and thistles shall it put forth for thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. [19] In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread until thou return to the ground — for from it thou wast taken; for dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return. [20] And the man called the name of his wife Ḥawwah, because she was the mother of every one living. [21] But Yahweh God made for the ‡ man ‡ and his wife tunics of skin and clothed them.

(3) [22] Then said Yahweh God, Lo, the man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, lest he stretch forth his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever, — [23] then Yahweh God sent him from the garden of ʿEdhen, to till the ground whence he was taken. [24] And when he had driven the man forth, he stationed eastward of the garden of ʿEdhen cherubs and a gleaming, whirling sword, to guard the way to the tree of life.

* Gr. Sam. † Gr.; text, *'Adham.* ‡ Gr.; text, *'Adham.*

2, a, (1) (a) iv. 1 **Then the man knew Ḥawwah his wife, and she conceived and bore Ḳayin. And she said, I have gained a man with Yahweh.** 2 Again, she bore his brother Hebhel; and Hebhel became a keeper of sheep, **but Ḳayin became a tiller of the ground.** 3 Thus it came to pass after a time, that Ḳayin brought from the produce of the ground an offering to Yahweh; 4 while Hebhel brought from the firstlings of his flock, even from their fat. And Yahweh had regard to Hebhel and his offering; 5 but to Ḳayin and his offering he had not regard. Thereupon was Ḳayin very angry and downcast. 6 But Yahweh said to Ḳayin, Why art thou angry? and why art thou downcast? 7 If thou doest well, is there not acceptance? and, if thou doest not well, doth not sin lie at the door? Yet toward thee shall be its longing, and thou shalt rule over it.

(b) 8 Then Ḳayin said to Hebhel, [Let us go to the field];* and it came to pass that, when they were in the field, Ḳayin assailed Hebhel his brother and killed him. 9 But Yahweh said to Ḳayin, Where is Hebhel thy brother? And he said, I know not. Am I my brother's keeper? 10 Then he said, What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the ground. 11 Now, therefore, cursed shalt thou be from the ground, that hath opened its mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. 12 When thou tillest the ground, it shall no longer yield thee its wealth. A wanderer and a fugitive shalt thou be in the earth. 13 But Ḳayin said to Yahweh, My punishment is greater than I can bear. 14 Lo, thou hast this day banished me from the face of the ground, and from thy face I must hide myself, becoming a wanderer and a fugitive in the earth; so that it will come to pass, that whosoever meeteth me will kill me. 15 And Yahweh said to him, Therefore if any one kill Ḳayin, he shall be avenged sevenfold. So Yahweh appointed a sign for Ḳayin,

* Gr. Sam. Syr.

that whosoever met him should not kill him. [16] And Ḳayin went forth from the presence of Yahweh **and dwelt in the land of Nodh, eastward of 'Edhen.**

(2) [17] **Then Ḳayin knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Ḥanokh. He * was * the builder of a city, which he called, after his** son's **name, Ḥanokh.** [18] **There was born to Hanokh also 'Iradh; and 'Iradh begot Meḥiyya'el; † and Meḥiyya'el begot Methusha'el; and Methusha'el begot Lemekh.** [19] **Now Lemekh took to himself two wives: the name of the one was 'Adhah, and the name of the second Ṣillah.** [20] **And 'Adhah bore Yabhal: he was the father of** [every] **one that dwelleth in tents with cattle.** [21] **And the name of his brother was Yubhal: he was the father of every one that handleth the lyre and the pipe.** [22] **Ṣillah, also, bore Tubhal** Ḳayin: **he ‡ was ‡ the ‡ father ‡ of ‡ every one that worketh copper. And the sister of Tubhal** Ḳayin **was Na'amah.** [23] **And Lemekh said to his wives:**

'Adhah and Ṣillah, hear my voice:
Wives of Lemekh, give ear to my speech:
For a man I slay, if I am wounded,
And a boy for a wale given me.
[24] **If Ḳayin was avenged sevenfold,**
Then shall Lemekh be seventy and seven times.

b (1) [25] Then the § man § knew his wife again, [and she conceived] ‖ and bore a son, and she called his name Sheth, saying, God hath sent me other offspring instead of Hebhel, since Ḳayin hath killed him. [26] To Sheth, also, was born a son, and he called his name 'Enosh. He ¶ was ¶ the ¶ first ¶ to call on the name of Yahweh.

* Text, *and (he) was.*
‡ Text, *hammerer.*
‖ Gr. Syr.
† Sam.; text, *Meḥuya'el.*
§ Text, *'Adham.*
¶ Vul.; text, *then was begun.*

(2) v. 1 This is the book of the generations of 'Adham. At the time when God created men, in the likeness of God made he them. 2 Male and female created he them. He also blessed them, and called their name Man, at the time of their creation. 3 And when 'Adham had lived a hundred and thirty years, he begot a child in his own likeness [and] * after his own image and called his name Sheth. 4 And 'Adham † lived † after begetting Sheth eight hundred years, and begot sons and daughters. 5 Thus all the days that 'Adham lived were nine hundred and thirty years; then he died.

6 And when Sheth had lived a hundred and five years, he begot 'Enosh. 7 And Sheth lived after begetting 'Enosh eight hundred and seven years, and begot sons and daughters. 8 Thus all the days of Sheth were nine hundred and twelve years; then he died.

9 And when 'Enosh had lived ninety years, he begot Ḳenan. 10 And 'Enosh lived after begetting Ḳenan eight hundred and fifteen years, and begot sons and daughters. 11 Thus all the days of 'Enosh were nine hundred and five years; then he died.

12 And when Ḳenan had lived seventy years, he begot Mahalal'el. 13 And Ḳenan lived after begetting Mahalal'el eight hundred and forty years, and begot sons and daughters. 14 Thus all the days of Ḳenan were nine hundred and ten years; then he died.

15 And when Mahalal'el had lived sixty-five years, he begot Yeredh. 16 And Mahalal'el lived after begetting Yeredh eight hundred and thirty years, and begot sons and daughters. 17 Thus all the days of Mahalal'el were eight hundred and ninety-five years; then he died.

18 And when Yeredh had lived a hundred sixty-two years, he begot Ḥanokh. 19 And Yeredh lived after be-

* Gr. . † Ar.; text, *the days of 'Adham were.*

getting Ḥanokh eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. [20] Thus all the days of Yeredh were nine hundred and sixty-two years; then he died.

[21] And when Ḥanokh had lived sixty-five years, he begot Methushelaḥ. [22] And Ḥanokh walked with God after begetting Methushelaḥ three hundred years, and begot sons and daughters. [23] Thus all the days of Ḥanokh were three hundred and sixty-five years. [24] But Ḥanokh walked with God, and was not, for God had taken him.

[25] And when Methushelaḥ had lived a hundred and eighty-seven years, he begot Lemekh. [26] And Methushelaḥ lived after begetting Lemekh seven hundred and eighty-two years, and begot sons and daughters. [27] Thus all the days of Methushelaḥ were nine hundred and sixty-nine years; then he died.

[28] And when Lemekh had lived a hundred and eighty-two years he begat a son. [29] **And he called his name Noaḥ, saying, He will ease us of our work and the toil of our hands from the ground, which Yahweh hath cursed.** [30] And Lemekh lived after begetting Noaḥ five hundred and ninety-five years, and begot sons and daughters. [31] Thus all the days of Lemekh were seven hundred and seventy-seven years; then he died.

[32] And when Noaḥ had become five hundred years old, Noaḥ begot Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth.

c [vi. 1] **Now it came to pass, when men had begun to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters had been born to them,** [2] **that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair, and they took to themselves as wives whomsoever they chose.** [3] **And Yahweh said, My spirit shall not abide in men forever, since they also are flesh; but their days shall be a hundred and twenty years.** [4] **[Now]* the giants were in the**

* Gr. Sam. Syr.

earth in those days, and also afterwards, **when the sons of God came to the daughters of men, and these bore them children. They are the heroes that of old were the men of renown.** [5] Now when Yahweh saw that the wickedness of men was great in the earth, and that every design of the thoughts of their hearts was only and always evil, [6] then was Yahweh sorry that he had made men in the earth, yea he was grieved to his heart. [7] Therefore Yahweh said, I will wipe men whom I have created off the face of the ground, —not only men, but cattle, and creeping things, and the birds of heaven, —for I am sorry that I made them. [8] But Noaḥ found favor in the eyes of Yahweh.

3, a (1) (a) [9] These are the generations of Noaḥ. Noaḥ was a just, a perfect man among his fellows: Noaḥ walked with God. [10] And Noaḥ begot three sons, Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth. [11] But the earth became corrupt before God; yea, the earth became full of violence. [12] And when God saw that lo, the earth was corrupt, because all flesh had perverted its way on the earth, [13] God said to Noaḥ, The end of all flesh hath come before me, for the earth is filled with violence on account of them; therefore lo, I will destroy them and * the earth. [14] Make thyself an ark of cypress wood. In cells shalt thou make the ark, and thou shalt smear it within and without with bitumen. [15] And this is how thou shalt make it: Three hundred cubits shall be the length of the ark; [and] † fifty cubits its width; and thirty cubits its height. [16] Light shalt thou provide for the ark, finishing it within a cubit of the top; and the door of the ark shalt thou place in the side of it. With a lower, a second, and a third story shalt thou make it.

* Gr.; text, *with*. † Gr. Sam. Syr.

17 For lo, I will bring the Flood water upon the earth, destroying all flesh in which is a living spirit under heaven; all that is in the earth shall perish. 18 But I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt go into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and the wives of thy sons, with thee. 19 Also of all * the * beasts,* of all flesh, two of each shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; a male and a female shall they be. 20 Of the birds after their kinds, and of the cattle after their kinds, [and] † of all the creeping things of the ground after their kinds, two of each shall come to thee to be kept alive. 21 Do thou also take of every food that is eaten and gather it to thee, that it may be for thee and for them to eat. 22 And Noaḥ did so; just as God commanded him, so he did.

(b) vii. 1 **Then Yahweh said to Noaḥ, Come thou, and all thy house, into the ark; for thee have I found righteous before me in this generation.** 2 **Of all the clean cattle thou shalt take to thee by sevens, a male and his mate, but of the cattle that are not clean by ‡ twos,‡ a male and his mate;** 3 **also of the** [clean] § **birds of heaven by sevens,** a male and a female, [**and of all the birds that are not clean by twos,** a male and a female,]‖ **to keep alive seed on the face of the whole earth.** 4 **For in yet seven days I will bring upon the earth a rain of forty days and forty nights, and I will wipe all the beings that I have made off the face of the ground.** 5 **And Noaḥ did just as Yahweh had commanded him.**

(2) (a) 6 Now Noaḥ was six hundred years old when the Flood happened water on the earth. 7 **And Noaḥ,** and his sons, and his wife, and the wives of his sons with him,

* Gr. Sam.; text, *every thing that liveth.* † Gr. Sam. Syr.
‡ Gr. Sam. Syr. § Gr. Sam. Syr. ‖ Gr.

went into the ark on account of the water of the Flood. [8] Of the clean cattle, and of the cattle that are not clean, and of the birds, and [of]* all that creep on the ground, [9] there came by twos to Noaḥ into the ark a male and a female, **as Yahweh† had commanded** Noaḥ. [10] **And it came to pass, that in the seven days the water of the Flood was on the earth.** [11] In the six hundredth year of the life of Noaḥ, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, — on that day all the sluices of the great deep were rent open and the windows of heaven undone; [12] **and the rain was on the earth forty days and forty nights.** [13] On that very day went Noaḥ, and Shem, and‡ Ḥam, and Yepheth, the sons of Noaḥ, and the wife of Noaḥ, and the three wives of his sons with him § into the ark; [14] they, and all the beasts after their kinds, and all the cattle after their kinds, and all the creeping things that creep on the earth after their kinds, and all the birds after their kinds, every bird of every feather. [15] Moreover, they came to Noaḥ into the ark by twos of all the || flesh in which was a living spirit; [16] and they that came came a male and a female of all flesh, as God had commanded him. **Then Yahweh shut him in.** [17] Now when the Flood had been forty days on the earth, **the water increased and lifted the ark, and it rose off the earth.** [18] And the water prevailed and increased greatly on the earth, and the ark moved on the face of the water. [19] Yea, the water prevailed very greatly on the earth, so that all the high mountains that are under all heaven were covered. [20] Fifteen cubits upward did the water prevail, and the mountains were covered. [21] Thus all flesh that moved on the earth perished, even birds, and cattle and beasts, and all the swarm that swarmed on the

* Gr. Sam. Syr. † Sam. Vul. Onk.; text, *God.*
‡ Sam. omits. § Gr. Syr.; text, *them.* || Sam. omits.

earth, and all mankind. [22] **Everything in whose nostrils was the breath of** the * spirit * of * **life, of all that was on the dry land, died.** [23] **Thus Yahweh † wiped out all the beings that were on the face of the ground,** not only men, but cattle, and creeping things, and birds of heaven; yea, they were wiped off the earth, **and there were left only Noaḥ and those that were with him in the ark.** [24] And the water prevailed on the earth a hundred and fifty days.

(b) [viii. 1] But God remembered Noaḥ, and all the beasts, and all the cattle that were with him in the ark; and God caused a wind to pass over the earth, and the water fell. [2] Moreover, the sluices of the deep and the windows of heaven were closed. **Then the rain from heaven ceased,** [3] **and the water continually withdrew from the earth.** Thus the water decreased from the end of a hundred and fifty days; [4] and in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, the ark grounded on the mountains of 'Ararat. [5] But the water continued to decrease until the tenth month; in the tenth month, on the first of the month, the tops of the mountains appeared. [6] **Now it came to pass at the end of forty days, that Noaḥ opened the window of the ark, that he had made,** [7] **and sent forth a raven; which went to and fro continually until the water dried off the earth.** [8] **Then he sent forth from him a dove, to see whether the water had subsided off the face of the ground.** [9] **But the dove found no resting-place for the sole of its foot: therefore it returned,—for there was water on the face of the whole earth,—and he stretched forth his hand, and took it, and brought it to him into the ark.** [10] **Then he waited yet seven days more, and again sent a dove forth from the ark;** [11] **and the dove came to him at eventide, and lo, there was a fresh olive leaf in**

* Gr. omits. † Text, *he*.

its mouth. Then Noaḥ knew that the water had subsided off the earth. [12] But he waited yet seven days more and sent forth a dove that did not return to him again. [13] Thus it came to pass, that in the six hundred and first year [of the life of Noaḥ],* in the first month, on the first day of the month, the water had dried off the earth. Then Noaḥ removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and lo, the face of the ground was dry. [14] Even in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, was the earth dry.

(3) (a) [15] Then God spake to Noaḥ, saying, [16] Go forth from the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and the wives of thy sons with thee. [17] All the beasts, [also],† that are with thee, of all flesh, even the birds, and the cattle, and all the creeping things that creep on the earth, bring forth with thee, that they may swarm in the earth, and increase and multiply on the earth. [18] So Noaḥ went forth, and his sons, and his wife, and the wives of his sons with him. [19] [Also] ‡ all the beasts, and all the birds, and § all § the § creeping § things § that § creep § on the earth, after their families, went forth from the ark. [20] Then Noaḥ built an altar to Yahweh, and, taking of all the clean cattle and all the clean birds, he offered burnt offerings on the altar. [21] And when Yahweh smelled the pleasant odor, Yahweh said to himself, I will not again curse the ground on men's account, because the design of the hearts of men is evil from their youth; nor will I again smite everything that liveth, as I have done. [22] While the earth endureth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.

* Gr. † Gr. Sam. Syr. ‡ Gr. Sam. Syr.

§ Sam.; text, *all the creeping things*, after *beasts*, and *every thing that creepeth*, after *birds*.

(b) ix. 1 Then God blessed Noaḥ and his sons and said to them, Increase and multiply, that ye may fill the earth; 2 so shall the fear of you, and the dread of you, be on all the beasts of the earth, and on all the birds of heaven, with all with which the water teemeth, and all the fish of the sea; into your hands are they given. 3 Every moving thing that liveth shall be yours to eat; like the green herb, I give you all. 4 Only flesh with its life, its blood, ye shall not eat. 5 Moreover, for your blood, your lives, will I make demand; of any beast will I make demand for it; also at the hands of men, at the hand of each one's brother, will I make demand for the lives of men. 6 He that sheddeth men's blood, by men shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he men. 7 Increase rather, and multiply; [and] * swarm in the earth and exercise † lordship † over it.

(c) 8 Then God spake to Noaḥ and his sons with him, saying, 9 Lo, I will establish my covenant with you and your offspring after you; 10 also with all the living creatures that are with you, even the birds, [and] ‡ the cattle, and all the beasts of the earth with you: from all that go forth from the ark to all the beasts of the earth. 11 Yea, I will establish a covenant with you, that all flesh shall not again be cut off by the water of a flood, and that there shall not again be a flood to ravage the earth. 12 God also said, This is the sign of the covenant that I will place between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, to endless generations: 13 My bow will I place in the clouds, that it may be a sign of a covenant between me and the earth. 14 So shall it come to pass, that, when I overspread the earth with a cloud, the bow shall appear in the cloud; 15 that I may remember my covenant that is between me and you, and every liv-

* Gr. Sam. Syr. † Text, *multiply*. ‡ Gr. Sam. Syr.

ing thing of all flesh, and that the water may not again become a flood destroying all flesh. 16 When the bow is in the cloud, I shall see it and remember that there is an endless covenant between God and every living creature, of all flesh, that is on the earth. 17 And God said to Noaḥ, This is the sign of the covenant that I establish between me and all flesh that is on the earth.

b. 18 **Now the sons of Noaḥ, that went forth from the ark, were Shem, and Ḥam, and Yepheth; and Ḥam was the father of Kena'an.** These three were the sons of Noaḥ, and from these the whole earth spread themselves abroad. 20 **Then Noaḥ, the husbandman, planted the first vineyard; 21 and, drinking of the wine, he became drunk and exposed himself within his tent. 22 Now when Ḥam, the father of Kena'an saw the nakedness of his father, he told his two brethren without. 23 Then Shem and Yepheth took a cloak and, placing it upon the shoulders of both of them, went backward and covered the nakedness of their father; their faces being backward, so that they saw not the nakedness of their father. 24 But when Noaḥ awoke from his wine and learned what his youngest son had done to him, 25 he said,**

Cursed be Kena'an:
Lowest of servants shall he be to his brethren.

26 He said also,

Blessed of * Yahweh * be * Shem:
And let Kena'an be a servant to him.
27 May God enlarge Yepheth.
Yea, let him dwell in the tents of Shem:
And let Kena'an be a servant to him.

28 And Noaḥ lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years. 29 Thus all the days of Noaḥ were nine hundred and fifty years; then he died.

* Text, *be Yahweh God of.*

4, a, (1) (a) [x. 1] Now these are the generations of the sons of Noaḥ, Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth; and there were born to them sons after the Flood. [2] The sons of Yepheth were Gomer, and Maghogh, and Maday, and Yawan, and Tubhal, and Moshekh,* and Tiras. [3] And the sons of Gomer were 'Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togharmah. [4] And the sons of Yawan were 'Elishah and Tarshish, Kittites and Rodhanites.† [5] From these the coasts of the nations dispersed themselves. [These were the sons of Yepheth] in their lands, each after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.

(b) [6] And the sons of Ḥam were Kush, and Miṣrayim, and Puṭ, and Kena'an. [7] And the sons of Kush were Sebha, and Ḥawilah, and Sabhtah, and Ra'mah, and Sabhtekha; and the sons of Ra'mah were Shebha and Dedhan. [8] Now Kush begot Nimrodh: he was the first to become a potentate in the earth. [9] He was mighty in hunting before Yahweh; therefore it is said, Like Nimrodh, mighty in hunting before Yahweh. [10] And the beginning of his kingdom was Babhel, and 'Orekh,‡ and 'Akkadh, and Kalneh in the land of Shin'ar. [11] From that land he went forth to 'Asshur and built Nineweh, and Rehobhoth-'ir, and Kalaḥ, [12] and Resen between Nineweh and Kalaḥ; that is the great city. [13] And Miṣrayim begot Ludhites, and 'Anamites, and Lehabhites, and Naphtuḥites, [14] and Pathrusites, and Kasluḥites, whence went forth Pelishtites, and Kaphtorites. [15] And Kena'an begot Ṣidhon, his firstborn, and Ḥeth, [16] and the Yebhusite, and the 'Emorite, and the Girgashite, [17] and the Ḥiwwite, and the 'Arḳite, and the Sinite, [18] and the 'Arwadite, and the Ṣemarite, and the Ḥamathite; and afterwards the families of the Kena'anite spread

* Gr. Sam.; Text, *Meshekh*. † Gr. Sam.; Text, *Dodhanites*.
‡ Gr.; text, *'Erekh*.

themselves abroad. 19 Thus the border of the Kena-
'anite was from Ṣidhon as far as Gerar, unto 'Azzah,
as far as Sedhom, and 'Amorah, and 'Adhmah, and Ṣeboyim,
unto Lesha'. 20 These are the sons of Ḥam, after their
families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their na-
tions.

(c) 21 Children were born to Shem also, the father of
all the sons of 'Ebher, the elder brother of Yepheth.
22 The sons of Shem were 'Elam, and 'Asshur, and 'Ar-
pakhshadh, and Ludh, and 'Aram. 23 And the sons of
'Aram were 'Uṣ, and Ḥul, and Gether, and Mash. 24 And
'Arpakhshadh begot Shelaḥ, and Shelaḥ begot 'Ebher.
25 To 'Ebher also were born two sons; the name of the
one was Pelegh, — for in his days the earth was separated,
— and the name of his brother was Yoḳtan. 26 And
Yoḳtan begot 'Almodhadh, and Sheleph, and Ḥaṣar-
maweth, and Yeraḥ, 27 and Hadhoram, and 'Uzal, and
Diḳlah, 28 and 'Obhal, and 'Abhima'el, and Shebha,
29 and 'Ophir, and Ḥawilah, and Yobhabh. All these
the sons were of Yoḳtan. 30 And their abode was from
Mesha to Sephar, the eastern mountain. 31 These were
the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues,
in their lands, in * their nations. 32 These are the families
of the sons of Noaḥ, after their generations, in their na-
tions; and from these the nations dispersed themselves
in the earth after the Flood.

(2) xi. 1 **Now the whole earth was of one language**
and had the same words. 2 **And it came to pass,**
as they moved eastward, that they came upon a
plain in the land of Shin'ar, and there they abode.
3 **Then said they one to another, Come, let us mould**
bricks and burn them thoroughly. Thus they had
brick for stone, and bitumen they had for mortar.

* Gr. Syr.; text, *after*.

[4] They said also, Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower with its top in heaven, that we may make ourselves a name, lest we be scattered over the face of the whole earth. [5] But Yahweh came down to see the city, and the tower that the sons of men had built. [6] And Yahweh said, Lo they are one people, and they all have one language; and this is their first exploit. And now nothing that they plan to do will be too hard for them. [7] Come, let us go down and there confound their language, so that they will not understand one another's language. [8] Thus Yahweh scattered them thence over the face of the whole earth, and they ceased from building the city. [9] Therefore they called its name Babhel, because there Yahweh confounded the language of the whole earth, and thence Yahweh scattered them over the face of the whole earth.

b. [10] These are the generations of Shem. When Shem was a hundred years old, he begot 'Arpakhshadh, two years after the Flood. [11] And Shem lived after begetting 'Arpakhshadh five hundred years, and begot sons and daughters.

[12] And when 'Arpakhshadh had lived thirty-five years, he begot Shelaḥ. [13] And 'Arpakhshadh lived after begetting Shelaḥ four hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters.

[14] And when Shelaḥ had lived thirty years, he begot 'Ebher. [15] And Shelaḥ lived after begetting 'Ebher four hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters.

[16] And when 'Ebher had lived thirty-four years, he begot Pelegh. [17] And 'Ebher lived after begetting Pelegh four hundred and thirty years, and begot sons and daughters.

[18] And when Pelegh had lived thirty years, he begot

Re'u. [19] And Pelegh lived after begetting Re'u two hundred and nine years, and begot sons and daughters.

[20] And when Re'u had lived thirty-two years, he begot Serugh. [21] And Re'u lived after begetting Serugh two hundred and seven years, and begot sons and daughters.

[22] And when Serugh had lived thirty years, he begot Naḥor. [23] And Serugh lived after begetting Naḥor two hundred years, and begot sons and daughters.

[24] And when Naḥor had lived twenty-nine years, he begot Teraḥ. [25] And Naḥor lived after begetting Teraḥ a hundred and nineteen years, and begot sons and daughters.

[26] And when Teraḥ had lived seventy years, he begat 'Abhram, Naḥor, and Haran.

c. [27] Now these are the generations of Teraḥ. Teraḥ begot 'Abhram, Naḥor, and Haran; and Haran begot Loṭ. [28] **And Haran died before Teraḥ his father in the land of his birth,** in 'Ur of the Kaldeans. [29] **But 'Abhram and Naḥor took themselves wives: the name of the wife of 'Abhram was Śaray, and the name of the wife of Naḥor was Milkah, the daughter of Haran, the father of Milkah and the father of Yiskah.** [30] **Now Śaray was barren; she had no child.** [31] Then Teraḥ took 'Abhram, his son, and Loṭ, the son of Haran, his grandson, and Śaray, his daughter-in-law, the wife of 'Abhram, his son, and went * forth with them from 'Ur of the Kaldeans, to go to the land of Kena'an; but, when they reached Ḥaran, they abode there. [32] And the days of Teraḥ were two hundred and five years; then Teraḥ died in Ḥaran.

* Syr.; text makes the verb plural.

II. COMMENTS

The first eleven chapters of Genesis embody the traditions, more or less elaborated, among the Hebrews with reference to the early history of the world and its inhabitants. They may therefore be treated under the general title of

I. THE WORLD BEFORE ABRAHAM (i.–xi.).

Of these eleven chapters the first three have to do with the origin of the world and the fundamental conditions under which man was created and still exists on the earth, or

1. The Origin of Things (i.–iii.).

But things as they exist, according to the Hebrews, are partly the product of divine activity and partly the result of human disturbance of the divine plan. Hence there are two parts to this division, the first of which deals with

a. The Work of God (i.–ii.).

This is presented in two distinct accounts, which, although they agree in certain fundamental features, were written by different authors, and therefore differ from each other, not only in style and standpoint, but sometimes also in conception. See the Introduction, p. 17 ff.

(1) The First Account (i. 1–ii. 3), an excerpt from the Priestly narrative, falls into seven paragraphs, the first six of which correspond to the six periods into which the divine activity is divided, while the seventh describes the origin of the Sabbath. The record of

(a) *The First Day* (i. 1–5) begins with a dogmatic statement attributing all things to God as the First Cause. 1. **In the beginning**, when the present order of things had its origin, is the proper starting-point for a history of the earth and its inhabitants.* The sole agent in the work to be described is **God**. The name is one of the peculiarities of the Priestly style as far as Ex. vi. 3. See the Introduction, p. 17. It denotes the Supreme Power whose hand the writer traces in all subsequent events, and whose will he recognizes as the only moral standard.† Of him it is said, that he **created**, produced, as something new (Num. xvi. 30), by his divine energy (Isa. xl. 26), but, as the next verse clearly teaches, out of previously existing materials (Isa. lxv. 17 f.), **heaven‡ and earth**, the visible universe in its original perfection

* The fact that בראשית is elsewhere (Jer. xxvi. 1; etc.) always followed by a dependent Genitive has given rise to the suggestion, that the next word, ברא, *create*, should be, not a Perfect, but an Infinitive, and that therefore the verse should be regarded as a protasis to *v.* 2 (Aben Ezra) or *v.* 3 (Rashi), and translated, *In the beginning of God's creating*, or, more freely, *When God began to create, heaven and earth*. The analogy of ii. 4b points in the same direction. On the other hand, Isa. xlvi. 10, where מראשית, *from the beginning*, is used absolutely, shows that the present text is defensible. Of course, if the emendation suggested be adopted, no interpretation for the introductory phrase but the one above given is admissible.

† The original of *God*, אלהים, being plural, is sometimes construed with a plural verb (xx. 13) or adjective (Jos. xxiv. 19), a circumstance that gives some ground for explaining it as a relic of polytheism among the Hebrews (Baudissin, *Stud.* I. 55 f.); but whatever may have been its origin, this author never betrays any sympathy with such a conception. On the form, see Ges. § 124, 1, *c*; on the construction, comp. 2 Sam. vii. 23 and 1 Chr. xvii. 21.

‡ The original of this word also is a plural, but, since the form in this case denotes extension, and not plurality, it should not be reproduced in English. See Ges. § 124, 1, *a*.

(ii. 1). This is the natural interpretation of the verse. It is therefore the briefest possible statement to the effect that the present frame of things owes its existence to the divinity worshipped by the Hebrews.

2. The first creative act is introduced by a description of the conditions under which God began his work. There are those who deny that *v.* 2 takes the reader back to the beginning. They contend that it describes the condition in which something, whose creation is revealed in *v.* 1, was, when God proceeded with the execution of his plan (Delitzsch). This view, however, requires a forced interpretation of the terms *heaven* and *earth*, and ignores the demands of the structure of *v.* 2. It is a circumstantial sentence. In such cases the fact or state described is regularly contemporaneous with the principal event, and the connective by which it is introduced, lit. *and*, equivalent to the English **now**.* This being so, **the earth** can here only mean the mass of matter out of which the world was finally created; in other words, chaos. It is so called, because the author thought of it as a single whole including the substance of the earth, located where the earth was destined to remain. What was its origin he does not say. When the scene opens, it is there, **waste and void**, a mere expanse of matter, without either features or inhabitants. The absence of life is partly explained by the **darkness** that **was on the face of the deep**. *Deep*, being the parallel of *earth*, the word used in the first half of the line, confirms the correctness of the interpretation given to the latter, at the same time disclosing more perfectly the author's conception of the nature of chaos. To him it was a mass of water, under which a solid element was submerged. See *v.* 9; also Ps. civ. 6, where the poet, picturing the same thing, says,

* See Ges. § 142, 1, R 1.

> "With the deep, as with a garment, thou coveredst it;
> The water lay over the mountains."

The Babylonians had the same conception.* They, however, represented chaos as antedating the Creator. Not so the Hebrew author. He teaches that, when time began, **the spirit of God**, the unseen, but mighty, Agency by which creation was wrought, **brooded**, was brooding, **over the face of the water**. In other words, although he does not assert the eternity of God, he does not permit one to think of anything as existing before or without the Deity. Compare the Babylonian myth according to which the earliest gods sprang from chaos. Note also that, unlike the Phœnicians, in whose cosmogony a "spirit" plays an important part (Baudissin, *Stud.* i. 11, 44 f.) he betrays no tendency toward pantheism.

3. God at once comes to expression; **God said**, at the same time exerting, through his spirit, the power by which his will was fulfilled. Hence the expression *spirit of God* is used interchangeably with *word of God*. Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 6 and civ. 30. He first commanded **light**, a prime requisite for the calculation of time, as well as a necessary condition for the existence of life of any sort on the earth; **and there was light**, without an interval of preparation or development between the command and its fulfilment.† It is useless to attempt to explain the

* One of their accounts of creation says that primevally "all the lands were sea" (Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 40 f.; Ball, *LE*, 19; Jastrow, *RBA*, 445); and another that

> "There was a time when heaven above was not,
> When earth below as yet did not exist;
> The primal Ocean generated them,
> The raging Deep was mother to them both."

See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 2 f.; *KAT*, 1 ff.; Ball, *LE*, 2; comp. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 272.

† In the Babylonian myth the test of Marduk's supremacy is his

source or nature of this light in harmony with the theories of modern science. It was neither solar light (Murphy) nor nebular light (Guyot); since the author clearly knows nothing of any matter except the undivided mass of which the surface was entirely water. To the question, How can there have been light without a luminous body to produce it? he would doubtless have replied that, since the sun, etc., received their illuminating power from God, there was no difficulty in believing that the same effect might be, and originally was, produced by the divine fiat, without the intervention of such instruments. See Job xxxviii. 19 f. He therefore represents the Creator as not only commanding light, but ordaining the alternation of light and darkness, before the heavenly luminaries existed.* Comp. Murphy. 4a. The light, when it appeared, was found **good**; not in comparison with the darkness that preceded it (Gunkel), — God still has a use for that, — but as perfectly suited to the divine purpose. See Ps. civ. 31.

4b. The remainder of *v.* 4 belongs with the first half of *v.* 5. The two together describe the origin of day and night. **God separated the light from the darkness**; fixed definite limits for their duration, and ordained that they should thenceforth alternate with each other in the world. 5a. He **called the light**, or, strictly, that part of the diurnal period during which light reigns, **Day**, as it has ever since been termed; **and the darkness**, or the part during which darkness reigns, **he called Night.**

5b. The author, as has already been remarked, does

ability to make a garment vanish and reappear at his command. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 22 f.; Ball, *LE*, 8.

* The Babylonians also represented light as existing before the creation of the heavenly bodies, the solar deity, Marduk, being a son of one of the great gods (Gunkel, *SC*, 116).

not seem to have thought of God as requiring any given length of time for his works; yet, between those just described and the one to follow, **it became evening**, the evening of the first bright period after the creation of light. Then, after the interval of darkness for which the divine wisdom had provided, it became **morning**, the second morning. The whole interval between the two constituted **one day**. The meaning of the word *day* in this connection is disputed. Some, following Augustine, take it figuratively, as an indefinitely extended period, because (*1*) it is indefinite in ii. 4 and elsewhere, and in Ps. xc. 4 a thousand years are said to be as a day with God; and (*2*) there was as yet no sun by which a natural day could be measured. The basal reason, however, for this interpretation is (*3*) that it is required to harmonize the teaching of the Bible with the results of scientific investigation. The irrelevancy of all these arguments is apparent. The question is not, what the word *may*, but what it actually *does* mean; and this must be determined by examining it in the relations in which it is employed, without reference to the demands of modern science or theology. An examination of this sort confirms the impression made upon the casual reader; *viz.*, that *day* here means simply a period of twenty-four hours. (*1*) This interpretation is in harmony with the writer's evident purpose, to describe the origin of the visible world and its more salient phenomena. See the literal *heaven* of *v.* 8, and the literal *earth* and *sea* of *v.* 10. (*2*) The day in question commenced in the morning, as the literal day originally did among the Hebrews, as well as among the Babylonians (*Enc. Bib.* Art. *Day*), and consisted of a light portion called by a familiar name, and a dark portion similarly designated. (*3*) It is one of seven days, the last of which was the first Sabbath in

the world's history. (*4*) The literal interpretation furnishes a starting point for time and the author's careful system of chronology. Finally, (*5*) as has been suggested, it is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the account to suppose that, to the mind of its author, God required time for the production of his works. These considerations show that the traditional is, in this case, the natural and rational interpretation, while that which gives the word *day* a figurative meaning of any sort is mistaken. Comp. Delitzsch.

(b) *The Second Day* (*vv.* 6–8). 6. The second morning dawned on the same watery waste described in *v.* 2. In this God commanded that there should shape itself **an expanse**, a solid partition, **in the middle**, and parallel with the surface, **of the water**; making a lateral **division** in the fluid mass: **and so it was**.* The last clause takes the place of a repetition of the preceding sentence, with an effect much the same as that produced in *v.* 3. The impression here also is that the divine command was no sooner given than fulfilled.

7. **Thus God made the expanse**. The material of which it was made is not indicated, but the following words describe more fully the purpose that it served. **It**† **separated the water that was under** it, the water eventually collected into the sea of Hebrew geography (*v.* 10), **from the water that was above** it, the water stored in the unseen celestial reservoirs (Ps.

* The Hebrew text inserts these words at the end of *v.* 7; but their occurrence immediately after the creative command in *vv.* 9, 11, 15, and 24 shows that the Greek Version, which is here followed, has the correct reading.

† The text has *God*, but the preceding verse shows that the subject is the expanse. So the Syriac Version.

cxlviii. 4), to be poured as a curse or a blessing upon the earth (vii. 11; Ps. civ. 13).

8. This solid structure, by which the Hebrews represented the earth as overarched (Prv. viii. 27 f.),* and above which they located the dwelling of the Almighty (Am. ix. 6; Ps. civ. 3), God called **Heaven**. Following this statement the reader misses, in the original, as well as in the English Version, the declaration that finds a corresponding place in all the other sections of this chapter. The omission is sometimes explained (*1*) by supposing that the author restricted himself in the use of it to seven times, or (*2*) that, since neither heaven nor earth was as yet complete, he did not think it appropriate in the present case (Delitzsch). Neither of these reasons, however, has much weight. On the second, see *v.* 10. Hence it seems safe to assume that here, also, the writer added, **and God saw that it was good**.†

(c) *The Third Day* (*vv.* 9–12). 9. The removal of the water above the expanse did not change the face of the rest of chaos. It was still, to all appearance, entirely water. God next commanded **the water under heaven**

* The Babylonians also; see Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 9 f.

† The Babylonians represented heaven as formed from one half of the body of Tiamat, when Marduk slew her. The following are the lines from the Creation Epic bearing on the subject:

> "He split her, like a flattened fish, in two;
> Took half of her and made it heaven's vault;
> Then drew a bolt across and stationed guards,
> Them charging not to let her water forth."

See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 30 f.; Ball, *LE*, 11; Jastrow, *RBA*, 428; comp. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 343. Berosus interpreted this as meaning that Bel (Marduk) divided the primeval darkness, and thus separated earth and heaven (Cory, *AF*, 59).

to **gather itself into one mass**,* a more compact body, that **dry ground**,† the solid element hitherto concealed, might **appear**; and this also took place.

10. Here, again, the original is defective; and here, again, the Greek Version supplies the missing statement, **Thus the water under heaven gathered itself into its mass, and dry ground appeared.** The way in which this result was produced is not explained, but, as the author seems to have believed, with other Hebrews, that the land was not only surrounded by, but supported on the water (vii. 11; Ex. xx. 4; Ps. xxiv. 2),‡ he may have thought of it as making its appearance by simply coming to the surface. See the picturesque description of Ps. civ. 7 ff.; also Job xxxviii. 8 ff. In harmony with this conception God called **the mass of water**, viewed as a single whole, **Sea**, not *seas*.§ Comp. E. V. Note that land and sea are pronounced **good** under circumstances precisely such as those under which the present text of *v.* 8 omits this formula. Hence, the principal reason usually given for its omission in that passage is invalid.

11. To the work already wrought God now, as in the case of the sixth day, adds a second: **the land**, freed from its watery covering and exposed to the quickening influence of the light, is commanded to **put forth vegetation** of all kinds. The various species are grouped

* The original has מקום, *place*, but, since the Greek Version has the equivalent of מקוה, *mass*, and this word is used in *v.* 10 for the thing here signified, the substitution of the latter for the former seems justified. See Ball.

† The original has *the dry ground*, but the analogy of אור (*v.* 3), etc., requires that the article be omitted. Comp. Ball.

‡ So also the Babylonians. See Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 253.

§ The original is plural, but here, as in the cases of the words for *heaven* and *water*, the form denotes, not plurality, but extension. See Ges. § 124, 1, *a*.

under two heads, the first of which is the **herb**, the smaller plants, including grasses for animals, and grains and vegetables for both them and man (*vv.* 29 f.; Jer. xiv. 6; Deu. xi. 15; Ps. civ. 14); **yielding seed**, by which they may be reproduced; **after its kind**,* with its, *i. e.*, the herb's, characteristics. The second order, the **tree**,† is described as **bearing fruit, wherein**, *i. e.*, in the fruit, **is its seed**, the seed by which the tree is to be propagated, **after its kind**,‡ **on the earth**, of which the land is only a part.§

12. The land **put forth**,‖ as was commanded, vegetation of the kinds described; and again, for the fourth time, the Creator was well pleased.

(d) *The Fourth Day* (*vv.* 14–20). 14. The work of the fourth day completes that of the first. On the first day God created light; on the fourth, he commanded that there be **lights**. The language used implies that, previous to this time, nothing of the kind had existed.

* This phrase, omitted in the Hebrew text, is supplied from *v.* 12. On the form למינהו, see Ges. § 91, 1, R 1, *b*; on the meaning comp. Frd. Delitzsch, *HA*, 70 f. The Greek Version adds *after likeness* both here and in *v.* 12.

† The text has *fruit-tree*, but this is too restricted, and, as appears from *v.* 12, was not the original reading.

‡ The text inserts this phrase after *fruit*, but by such an arrangement the relative *wherein* is separated from its antecedent, and the meaning obscured. The difficulty is avoided by adopting, as is done above, the Greek reading. The form, moreover, in the original should be, not, למינו, but למינהו, as elsewhere, except in Lev. xi. 15, 22 and Deu. xiv. 14.

§ The rendering *earth* is necessary to avoid tautology. Perhaps the whole phrase, which is superfluous, should be omitted; as it is in the next verse.

‖ The present text, probably, as Ball suggests, by mistake, has תוציא, *let it cause to go forth*, instead of the תדשא, *let it cause to shoot*, of the preceding verse.

This natural inference is confirmed by *v.* 16, where their creation as new phenomena in the world is distinctly affirmed. Comp. Murphy. These lights are to be **in the expanse of heaven**. This expression must be interpreted in the light of what has preceded. If the author really thought of heaven as a material canopy, he must have shared to some extent the primitive conception with reference to the heavenly bodies which was current in his time, to the effect that they were in some way attached to it.* These bodies were to serve several purposes. In the first place, they were **to distinguish between**, not to produce, — both had already been created, — **day and night**, as adjuncts of these divisions of the diurnal period. They were also to be **signs**, indicating points of the compass (Num. xxi. 11), changes in the weather (Mat. xvi. 2 f.), and extraordinary events (Joel iii. 3 f.; ii. 30 f.). Next, they were to mark the return of civil and ecclesiastical **seasons**; whose dates, among the Hebrews, were generally determined by the changes of the moon (Ps. civ. 19; Lev. xxiii.). Further, they were to measure **days and years**, as elements in the calculation of time (Jos. x. 12; 1 Kgs. xx. 22).

15. Having enumerated these four functions of the heavenly bodies, the author finally adds the one that would be the first to suggest itself to a modern thinker, **to shed light upon the earth**; doubtless for the purpose of explaining why, although the existence of light was not dependent on them, there was more of it when they appeared than when they were invisible.†

* On the Babylonian idea, see Jastrow, *RBA*, 442, 455.

† The Samaritans have this specification at the beginning (*v.* 14), as well as at the end, of the list; but the reading is probably an imitation, conscious or unconscious, of *vv.* 15 and 17. Compare also the Greek Version, which prefixes *to light the earth and to rule day and night* to *v.* 14.

16. The writer distinguishes **two great lights**, as if the sun and the moon were both larger than all the rest; the former being made **to rule**, *i. e.*, preside over, **day, the lesser** in like manner **to rule night**.* He merely mentions **the stars**, giving no hint of their actual size or their immense distance from the earth.†

17. These luminaries **God placed in the expanse**, assigning them their places with reference to one another and their courses across the face of heaven; and they began to perform the functions described. Notice, however, that, in repeating his account of these functions, the author takes greater liberties than he has heretofore allowed himself. Thus, the first of the previous enumeration now becomes the last, and the last, **to shed light upon the earth**, the first.

18. Moreover, no reference is here made to the appointment of the lights created for signs, etc., its place being taken by a specification strictly applicable only to the sun and the moon, *viz.*, **to rule over day and over night**; and in the next phrase **light** and **darkness** are substituted for the *day* and *night* of *v.* 14.‡

* On the comparative importance of the sun and the moon among the Babylonians, see Boscawen, *BM*, 57 ff.

† Baudissin (*Stud.* i. 120 f.) thinks that the use of the term *rule* of the heavenly bodies, as well as the fact that their creation is represented as postponed until the second half of the creative week, indicates that they were regarded by the author as personal beings. Comp. Gunkel, *SC*, 9.

‡ The Babylonian account of the creation of the heavenly bodies runs as follows: —

> "He made the stations for the greater gods;
> The stars, like them, as constellations placed.
> He fixed the year, and its divisions marked;
> For each of the twelve months three stars he set.
> Throughout the year, from end to end thereof,
> He fixed the place of Nibir [Jupiter] for their bound;
> That none might change its course or go astray.

(e) *The Fifth Day* (*vv.* 20–23). Hitherto there has been no animal life on the earth. God now commands that **the water swarm with abundant living creatures**. The term *swarm*, with its complement, *abundant*, lit. *swarm a swarm*, is intended to convey the impression of multitude. The writer, however, does not mean to indicate that the water was at first more thickly inhabited than in his own day. This is clear from *v.* 22. He is merely accounting for the multiplicity of life, or, as the psalmist (civ. 25) puts it, the "creeping things innumerable, both small and great beasts," with which the sea, as he knew it, teemed. At the same time God summons into existence **birds**; not the winged reptiles of the Jurassic period (Guyot), but, as appears from *v.* 21, the winged creatures popularly so designated when this account was written. They are to fly **over the earth, across the expanse of heaven**, *i. e.*, in the space between earth and heaven. Compare the English Version, where the rendering "in the open firmament" is misleading.*

21. Here, as in *v.* 16, the general gives place to the particular, and the most remarkable examples take precedence. In this case it is **the great monsters**, not the extinct reptiles of the Jurassic period (Guyot), but the huge forms of animal life, real or imaginary, with which the Hebrews peopled the great deep (Ps. civ. 25;

> With him he stablished Bel's and Ea's place.
> Then opened he on either side great doors,
> And made the bolt secure to left and right.
> Midway in heaven he the zenith fixed.
> He sent forth Nannar the [moon], gave night to his charge,
> Ordained him for the night, to measure days."

(Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 30 f.; Ball, *LE*, 12; Jastrow, *RBA*, 434 f.). In this passage the identification of the moon and the stars with divine beings is unmistakable.

* The present text of this verse should be corrected by the addition of **and so it was** from the Greek Version.

cxlviii. 7).* These God created, and **all the** other **living, moving creatures** that shared with them the watery element, **after their kinds**;† also **every winged bird**. The epithet *winged* does not imply that the author distinguished two kinds of birds, one of which had no wings, but simply emphasizes a familiar characteristic of the class so described.

22. Finally, **God blessed them**, by giving them, as he had already given the plants, the power of perpetuating their kind. This power is bestowed upon the aquatic animals, — which, however, are not mentioned by name, as one would expect them to be, in this connection, — that they may **fill the water in the sea**. The birds, on the other hand, are to **multiply on the land**.

(f) *The Sixth Day* (*vv.* 24–31). 24. The furniture of the **land** is still incomplete. It is now commanded to **produce living creatures**, beings of the same general character as those belonging to the sea, — animals. These are divided into three general classes, of which the first is **cattle**, here the domestic animals. Comp. vi. 7. The **creeping things** doubtless include not only reptiles, but all the other smaller animals that move on or near the ground; which are therefore in the next verse called *creeping things of the ground*. The **beasts‡ of the earth** are here the larger animals that

* Gunkel sees in these creatures a relic of the Babylonian conception of chaos, with its mythical monsters, as described by Berosus (*SC*, 17 f., 120; Cory, *AF*, 58).

† In the form לְמִינֵהֶם the vocalization is that of a plural; but the safer opinion, even if the suffix includes the sea-monsters, as well as the other aquatic animals, is that the noun is here, as in all other cases in which it is found, a singular. See Ew. § 247, *d*; comp. Ges. § 91, 2, R 1.

‡ On the form חַיְתוֹ, see Ges. § 90, 3, *b*; comp. *v.* 25. The Samaritans read חַיַּת.

roam at large and "seek their meat from God" (Ps. civ. 21). According to Ps. civ. 29, as well as Gen. ii. 19, all these animals were made of the material of the ground on which they were destined to live and move.

25. In reporting the fulfilment of the divine command the author employs the same terms that he has just used in a different order, but the change to **beasts of the earth, cattle** and **creeping things** does not seem to have any significance. There is probably just as little in the omission of a formal blessing on these animals, such as was bestowed upon those of the sea and the air. If it was intentional, the reason can only be a desire to avoid the repetition, at this point, of a formula easily supplied from *v.* 22. Comp. Delitzsch.*

26. On the sixth, as on the third day, there were two creative acts. The second was the production of nature's lord and God's masterpiece. The phraseology used is calculated to attract attention. God says, not, Let there be, or, Let the land bring forth, but, as if he now had on hand a matter in which he took more than usual interest, **Let us make**. It is a mistake to find in the employment here of a plural subject (*1*) an assertion of the majesty of God (Gesenius), (*2*) a summons to his divine powers (Dillmann), or (*3*) an intimation of the doctrine of the Trinity (Murphy). It is best interpreted as revealing the belief of the author in the existence, before the creation of men, of a race of intelligences even nearer to God than his human children were destined

* There are fragments of a Babylonian account of the creation of the land animals, in which the terms used are those employed by the Hebrews. One of them says,

> "The gods, when they together framed [the world],
> Created [heaven] and ordained [the earth],
> Caused living creatures to come forth . . . ,
> The cattle, the wild beasts, the creeping things."

(Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 42 f.; Ball, *LE*, 13.)

to stand. There are other references to such a heavenly court (*e. g.*, 1 Kgs. xxii. 19; Job i. 6; Ps. xxix. 9); which, according to Job xxxviii. 7, existed when the foundations of the earth were laid.* The objection that, by addressing the "sons of God" in these terms, the Creator would have made them sharers in one of his divine prerogatives (Dillmann) is easily met; since the form used, like the French *assister*, is warranted as merely recognizing the presence of interested spectators. See Isa. vi. 8.† The last of God's works is to be man in the collective sense, *i. e.*, **men.**‡ The nature of these new creatures is described in the phrase **in our image**; but not so clearly as it might have been, as is shown by the difference of opinion with reference to the meaning of these words. From *v.* 27 it appears that by *our image* is meant the image of God. The equivalence of these two expressions seems, at first sight, to tell against the interpretation of the plural pronoun just given, but the apparent discrepancy disappears, when one reflects that the image of God is also the image of the sons of God. The fact that, in *v.* 27, the phrase "image of God" takes the place of both of those here used shows that **after his likeness** is synonymous with the expression preceding. Comp. Delitzsch. The further question, what is meant by the image of God, seems answered in the remainder of the verse, where God is represented as setting forth the purpose for which men were to be created, *viz.*, **lordship** over every living thing, whether of

* According to Jub. ii. 1 the angels were created on the first day.

† This is the interpretation adopted by Philo (*Works*, i. 21 f.), and it seems to have been the favorite with Jewish authorities. See *Ber. Rab.* 31 ff.

‡ The verb of the next clause is plural.

the sea or of the land. The image of God, therefore, must consist in those endowments which distinguish men from the lower animals, and enable the former to maintain over the latter a mastery only inferior to that of the Creator. See ix. 2; Ps. viii. 6/5; Sir. xviii. 3; comp. Gunkel. These, however, are but reflections of the divine attributes most perfectly revealed in creation. None of the animals is excepted, even **the beasts** * **of the earth** being placed under the dominion of mankind.

27. Men were created **male and female**. Some of the Jewish authorities interpret these words as meaning that the human race sprang from a single androgyn, from one side (not rib) of whom God finally (ii. 21) made the first woman (*Ber. Rab.* 30), and Lenormant (*BH*, 61 ff.) adopts this interpretation; but there is absolutely no internal evidence to support it. In fact, it is forbidden by the terms of the blessing at once bestowed. See also v. 2. The author does not here indicate how many of the genus homo were created, but the sequel (v. 3) shows that he intended to teach that the human race, like the various species of the lower animals, concerning which his ideas may be inferred from vi. 19, had its origin in a single pair.†

28. In the blessing bestowed on the first pair they are commissioned, not only to **fill the earth**, but to **subdue it**. The last phrase is especially significant. It shows that, to the mind of the author, the earth was not a paradise in which men could live without effort, but a field for the employment and development of the powers, mental and physical as well as moral, with which they had been

* The text has *the earth;* but since ix. 2 and Ps. viii. 8/7 have *the beasts of the earth*, the missing word, חיתו, should doubtless be inserted in this passage. See the Syriac Version.

† The word ארו is equivalent to, if not a mistake for ארם.

endowed. God had worked hitherto; now they were not only to enter into, but supplement, the labors of their Maker. He had made, they were to control, the entire animal world.*

29. Men were not yet, however, permitted to kill, even for food, the animals thus placed "under their feet," but, according to the author, were restricted to an exclusively vegetable diet. See Ovid, *Met.* xv. 96 ff. Still, they were generously provided for, being given to eat **every herb** and **every tree**;† *i. e.*, all the grains and vegetables and whatever grew on the trees.‡

30. The lower animals, even **the beasts of the earth**, as well as **the birds of heaven** and **the creeping things**,§ at first received only **every green herb for food**; in other words, the lion was compelled, in the language of Isa. xi. 7, to "eat straw like the ox." See Vergil, *Geor.* i. 130; comp. Strack.‖ The cattle and the fish of the sea are not mentioned in this connection, perhaps because the former are included in the term *beasts of the earth* (comp. Knobel), and the author could not imagine the latter as ever having subsisted on the sort of food provided for land animals.

31. The work of this day, like that of the others, was

* The text of the latter half of this verse is clearly incomplete. It should follow *v.* 26, as it does in the Greek, and to the extent of supplying **the cattle** in the Syriac Version.

† For הָעֵץ read, with the Samaritans, עֵץ. Comp. Ball.

‡ The text, for **fruit**, has *fruit of a tree;* but since, according to *vv.* 11 f., it is strictly the fruit, and not the tree, that yields the seed by which the tree is reproduced, it is better, following the Greek Version, to omit the limiting phrase.

§ The subject of the participle is to be supplied from the Greek Version. For רומש the Samaritans read הרמש.

‖ The verb *give*, which is needed to make sense, is wanting in the original of this verse.

good, but the usual statement to that effect is omitted. Its place is taken by God's estimate of **all that he had made**. Viewed as a completed whole, he found it, not only satisfactory, but **very good**. The night that followed closed **a* sixth day.**†

The present arrangement of the text is such as, at first sight, to create the impression that the account of creation with which Genesis begins closes with the end of the first chapter. This, however, is not the case, since the record of

(g) *The Seventh Day* (ii. 1–3), in which the significance of its arrangement as a whole appears, is necessary to its completion.

1. The statement, **Thus**, lit. *and*, **heaven and earth were finished**, doubtless means that, at the close of the sixth day, they were complete; **and all their host**, not

* The present text has the definite article before the numeral, but the Greek Version omits it, and this, since there seems to be no reason why the author should adopt a peculiar mode of expression in this instance, is probably the correct reading. Comp. Ges. § 126, 5, R 1, *a*.

† The creation of mankind was attributed to different deities by the Babylonians of different dates and places. In the epic from which several quotations have already been made, Marduk is the one thus honored. He is praised as

> "The lord whose spell is health, who wakes the dead;
> Who mercy showed to the defeated gods,
> Took from the gods, his foes, the yoke imposed,
> And in their stead man into being brought."

See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 34 f.; Ball, *LE*, 16; Jastrow, *RBA*, 438. The poem, so far as preserved, does not give the details of man's origin, but Berosus says that Bel (Marduk), when he saw the earth, as the result of the destruction of a preceding race of monsters, without inhabitants, bade one of the other gods cut off his head, mix earth with the flowing blood, and thus make men and animals that could bear the light (Gunkel, *SC*, 17; Cory, *AF*, 60).

merely the sun, moon, and stars, elsewhere called *the host of heaven* (Deu. iv. 19), but the entire multitude of creatures, animate and inanimate, with which, during the preceding six days, heaven and earth had been furnished. The angels, since the author makes no reference to their creation, although he recognizes their existence (i. 26), can hardly be included. Comp. Strack.

2. What follows must be interpreted in harmony with this introductory statement. If, therefore, the present text be retained, the words which, in the English Version, are rendered, *And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had made*, etc., can only refer to the cessation of the activity of which the various works previously described were the result. This thought is better expressed by the rendering, **And when, on the seventh day, God had put an end to the**, lit. *his*, **work that he had done**, *i. e.*, had been doing, etc.* The correctness of this interpretation appears from its harmony with the obvious meaning of the latter half of the verse; where the statement, that God **rested on the seventh day from all the**, lit. *his*, **work that he had done** can only mean that, on the given day, he refrained from the work, the activity, in which he had previously been engaged.†

3. This seventh day, because on it he celebrated, so to speak, the completion of his works, God **blessed**, gave especial honor among the days of the week; and **hallowed**, ordained that it should be set apart as a day on

* On the construction, see Ges. § 111, 1, R 3. The versions have *the sixth day*, which is adopted by Ball and others, and, at first sight, seems the preferable reading; but the fact that it relieves an apparent difficulty excites suspicion, and the evidently close relation between the verbs כלה (*put an end to*) and שבת (*rest*) favors the present text. On the meaning of כלה, see Num. xvii. 25/10.

† On the meaning of מלאכה (*work*), compare Brown, *Lex.*

which men should not do any work. See Ex. xx. 9 f. The last clause preserves the distinction between the *work* and the *works* of God, being properly rendered, not, as in the English Version, *all his work, which God had created and made,* but strictly, *all his work, in doing which God had created, i. e.*, acted as Creator, or, more freely, **all the creative work that he had done**, *i. e.*, all the work that, as Creator, he had done.* Comp. Knobel.

A few words with reference to this narrative as a whole. Its value has sometimes been exaggerated, and sometimes, especially in later years, overlooked. In the first place, the attempt has been made to show that it is in perfect harmony with the science of the day.† If the interpretation given above is correct, it is clear that no such correspondence can be established. The modern theory concerning the origin of the system to which the earth belongs may be stated briefly as follows : —

The matter of the entire system, so far as can be ascertained, seems originally to have existed in a nebulous form. From this gaseous mass were thrown off rings of matter, which, when broken up and compacted in separate bodies, became the planets and their satellites. The earth, like the rest, was at first an incandescent ball;

* On the construction, see Joel ii. 20 f.; Ges. § 114, 2, R 4. The presence of אלהים (*God*) after ברא (*create*) suggests the question, whether the text did not originally have the Perfect instead of the Infinitive of עשה (*do*) as in the preceding verse, without either of these words.

† This is the position of Guyot in his *Creation*. See also the works of Principal Dawson, especially his *Eden Lost and Won*, in which the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and its general harmony with science and history is maintained. Dana, in the last (1895) edition of his *Manual of Geology*, omits the chapter on Cosmogony with which the book originally closed.

but it gradually cooled, and, as it cooled, the vapor by which it was surrounded was condensed and the globe, which had meanwhile become solid, at least superficially, was thus more or less covered with water. The cooling process continued until, by the consequent deformation of the spheroid, a distinction between regions of comparative elevation and depression, *i. e.*, continents and oceans, was established. Plants and animals made their appearance as soon as their existence was possible; the simplest forms first, then, as the ages passed, those of the higher orders, until, finally, when the proper environment had been provided, the process of evolution in the animal kingdom culminated in the production of the human species. The following table, compiled from Rice's revision of Dana's *Text Book of Geology*, shows (read upward) by what stages the development of life on the earth is supposed to have proceeded: —

Cenozoic Age	Quaternary Period.	The first men.
	Tertiary Period.	The first placental mammals. Age of mammals.
Mesozoic Age	Cretaceous Period.	The first angiosperms.
	Jurassic Period.	The first birds. Age of reptiles.
	Triassic Period.	The first mammals. Age of amphibia.
Paleozoic Age	Carboniferous Period.	The first reptiles. Age of forests.
	Devonian Period.	The first flowering plants. The first amphibia. Age of fishes.
	Silurian Period.	The first fishes. The first insects. The first land plants.
	Cambrian Period.	The first marine invertebrates. The first seaweeds.
Archean Age		Dubious traces of life.

The most serious discrepancies between this outline and the biblical account are the following : —

1. In the former the sun is the centre from which the system is viewed and described ; in the latter not only the sun and the moon, but also the stars, are mere adjuncts of the earth.

2. The current theory represents the earth, with all that belongs to it, as the result of a development requiring ages ; while the biblical narrative describes it as produced by a series of fiats, each of which was at once obeyed, and all of which were uttered within the space of six literal days.

3. The order in which the principal events in the course of the earth's early history are supposed to have succeeded one another is not the same as that followed by the sacred writer : —

a. If the current theory is correct, there must have been light long before there was any water on the surface of the globe ; but, according to the first chapter of Genesis, this is the reverse of the true order.

b. The scientist claims that fishes appeared in the sea as early as plants on the land, and that there were other water animals, as well as marine plants, much earlier ; but the inspired author reports that the vegetation of the earth was created on the third, while the fishes did not appear until the fifth day.

c. Finally, the rocks testify that fishes existed ages before the land animals (except a few insects) and the latter other ages before the first man ; but the biblical record states that the birds were created on the same day with the fishes, and the first human pair on the same day with the rest of the land animals.

These are serious divergences, but their significance may be exaggerated. They make it impossible for the

intelligent student to accept the biblical account as a correct record of the process of creation; but they do not make it necessary for him to reject it as valueless from the religious, or even from the scientific standpoint. In the first place, although the doctrine of God here taught can hardly be regarded as perfectly satisfactory to the Christian believer, it was sufficiently developed along right lines to furnish a basis for religion and morality unequalled in the period to which it belongs. The author's conception of creation, too, displays a philosophic insight that is extraordinary. Indeed, in its essential features, the unity of nature and the gradual origin of things, it harmonizes so perfectly with the modern theory that the latter should be regarded as supplemental, rather than abrogative, of the former. See Ryle, *ENG*, 23 ff. Finally, the fact that the Sabbath did not originate exactly as described does not warrant a denial of its sanctity; for, as in the case of Sunday, the antiquity of the Hebrew rest-day and the beneficent results of its observance are sufficient to assure one who has a sense for the divine that it was a providential institution.* See Gunkel, *SC*, 118, 170.

The author hitherto followed would naturally next proceed to give a brief history of the earliest generations of the race. There is such a history, but it is separated from his account of creation by the rest of the second, and the whole of two more chapters. In other words,

* The Babylonians from the earliest times seem to have regarded the seventh, the fourteenth, the twenty-first, and the twenty-eighth of each month as unlucky, and therefore, on these days, to have abstained, not only from their ordinary pursuits, but even from the presentation of sacrifices to their gods. See Schrader, *KAT*, 18 ff.; Boscawen, *BM*, 67 f.; Toy, *JBL*, 1899, 190 ff.

the continuation of the work from which this account of creation was taken is to be found in the fifth chapter. What now follows is

(2) A SECOND ACCOUNT (ii. 4–25) of creation. The first thing that strikes one on reading it is that it begins, not as the other did, with the creation of light, introducing life in the order of its manifestations from the lowest to the highest, but with

(a) *The Formation of Man* (*vv.* 4–7). 4. To the whole is prefixed a title, **These are the generations of heaven and earth**, such as elsewhere (v. 1; vi. 9; x. 1; etc.) always introduces an excerpt from the Priestly narrative, to which the preceding account belonged. The fact that it is here used to introduce a passage from the Yahwistic narrative is explained by supposing, either that it originally stood at the beginning of the first chapter, and was removed thence, when the two narratives were combined (Ilgen), or that it originated with a redactor or copyist, by whom it was inserted to relieve the abruptness of the transition from the first to the second account (Holzinger). The former of these suppositions seems the more attractive, the objection that the author of i. 1 ff. would not have given it this title being met by the fact that, in vi. 9, a similar title introduces, not a list of Noaḥ's descendants, but a history of his times. See also xxv. 19; xxxvii. 2.* The title is followed by the brief temporal clause, **when they**

* The idea that 4a is a subscription to the account preceding (Delitzsch) must be rejected; so, also, that it is the title of a missing chapter of the Priestly document (Strack). The former is forbidden by the constant usage with reference to the terms employed; and the latter by the close connection between ii. 3 and v. 1 ff., as well as the absence of any allusion to the hypothetical passage in the parts of the Priestly narrative that have been preserved. The Greek Version has, *This is the book of the origin of*, etc., as in v. 1, and Ball adopts this reading.

were created, of which, as the text now stands, the remainder of the verse seems a superfluous repetition. The two clauses, however, do not belong together; the latter, in some form, as its phraseology indicates, having originally been connected with what follows.* Here, as in the preceding account, there is no disposition to pry into the secrets of eternity. The story opens with a picture of the condition of things **at the time when Yahweh (God) made earth and heaven**; that is, as they were when Yahweh began his creative work. The most interesting thing about this clause is the appearance in it, for the first time, of **Yahweh**, the proper name of the God of the Hebrews, for which the English version usually has *LORD*.† The meaning of the name is disputed, but, according to Ex. iii. 14 f., it seems to have designated God as the unchangeable, in the moral as well as in the metaphysical sense.‡ The same passage, but Ex. vi. 2 f. more distinctly, teaches that it was not known or

* The original relation of 4b to the verses following is in dispute; some exegetes connecting it with *v.* 5 (Tuch), others with *v.* 7 (Dillmann). The latter construction seems too involved to be the one intended. See Driver, *Tenses*, § 124.

†The pronunciation *Jehovah*, unknown until 1520 A. D., has no warrant except in a superstitious custom in accordance with which the Jews, to avoid the use of the sacred name, pointed יהוה (*YHWH*) with the vowels of אֲדֹנָי (*'adhonay*), *Lord*, and, when reading their Scriptures, substituted the latter for the former. See Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, § 88. The *LORD* of the English, like the κύριος of the Greek Version, is a relic of this superstition. When the tetragrammaton was preceded by אדני, to avoid the repetition of the latter, the Hebrews pointed the former with the vowels of אֱלֹהִים (*'elohim*), *God*; hence the excuse for the *GOD* of the English Bible.

‡ On the origin of this name, see Baudissin, *SSR*, i. 179 ff.; Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 158 ff.; Driver, *SB*, i. 1 ff.; Schrader, *KAT*, 23 ff.; Piepenbring, *TOT*, 99 ff.

used before the time of Moses. The latter passage is from the Priestly document. Hence, it is not strange that the name does not occur in the first account of creation. The author of the second account, having no such theory, could, and did, employ it freely. In this and the following chapter, however, whenever *Yahweh* occurs, a later hand has, for some unknown reason, perhaps to insure the identification of the Deity of the second account with that of the first, inserted after it **God**.* The phrase **earth and heaven**, found elsewhere only in Ps. cxlviii. 13, can hardly be correct; but what the original reading was, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine.†

5. At this time **no shrub, no herb, of the field** existed, much less any tree. The earth was a waste; yet not, at least not wholly, a watery waste, as i. 2 teaches that it was in the beginning.‡ In fact, there was a dearth of water, because **Yahweh had not caused it to rain upon the earth**. The dependence of vegetation upon

* Budde (*BU*, 232 ff.) attributes the insertion of *God* in these chapters to the redactor who united J^1 and J^2, the latter of which, he thinks, must have avoided *Yahweh* as far as iv. 26. Comp. Holzinger, *EH*, 157 ff. The resulting combination occurs also Ex. ix. 30 and nine times outside of the Pentateuch.

† The ancient versions all have *heaven and earth*, the Greek with the article. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the order is the same, but the article is omitted. If this was the original order, the present reading may have been substituted for the other for the sake of variety. Since, however, the Yahwist does not elsewhere in his account of creation include heaven, it is also possible that the original reading was *earth*, or *the earth*, without the added term.

‡ In the second Babylonian account of creation occurs the line,

"No plant had sprouted, not a tree was made;"

but in this case the dearth of vegetation is explained by the fact that

"The lands were all and altogether sea."

See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 38 ff.; Ball, *LE*, 19.

moisture is here expressly recognized. There was, however, another reason for the barrenness that existed; **there were no men to till the ground**. In other words, to the mind of this author it was necessary that men should appear contemporaneously with plants. Hence, instead of postponing the creation of the former until the earth was otherwise completely furnished, as did the Priestly narrator, he introduces them as soon as the ground has become fit for cultivation. The difference is fundamental, making it impossible to suppose that both accounts are the work of one author.

6. The necessary moisture is provided, not by opening the windows of heaven and drawing upon the celestial reservoirs, but by a less direct and more familiar process. **A mist**, naturally through the agency of Yahweh, **rose** from time to time **from the earth**,* or that part of it covered by hitherto unrecognized seas. The mist, having risen, fell again in the form of rain and thoroughly and repeatedly **watered the whole face of the ground**.† Thus the process by which the earth has ever since been refreshed was instituted and the first requisite for the existence of animal as well as vegetable life provided.

7. When the ground had been made cultivable, Yahweh, proceeding to his second task, **formed man**, moulded him as a potter fashions a vessel.‡ The material out of

* Haupt (*AOS*, *Proc.*, 1896, 158 ff.) renders the first half of the verse, *an irrigating canal overflowed the land;* making אד nearly the equivalent of *edû*, the Assyrian for *flood*, and substituting על, *over*, for מן, *from*. See also the versions. However, it seems clear that the אד not only *goes up*, but supplies the *rain* without which, according to *v.* 5, there can be no vegetation. See also Job xxxvi. 27 f.

† On the uses of the tenses in this verse, see Ges. §§ 107, 1, a, and R 2; 112, 3, a, α.

‡ For a Babylonian parallel, see Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 292 ff.

which he formed him was **dust from the ground**; from which he afterward formed the beasts and the birds (*v.* 19).* The man thus produced, however, was at first as lifeless as the ground from which he had been taken. It was only when Yahweh **breathed into his nostrils the breath of life**, the breath by which life manifests itself, that he **became a living creature**. The term *living creature* occurs three times in the first chapter (*vv.* 20, 21, 24). In these and other cases it is applied to animals, exclusive of man. Here it is applied to him as an animate being, the first that ever existed.† Nothing is said or implied with reference to any endowments by which he might later be distinguished from other living creatures. Compare the corresponding passage in the first chapter (*vv.* 26 ff.), where the superiority of man is expressly taught.

The first account of man's creation represents him as immediately commissioned to subdue the earth and enjoy mastery over it; according to this second he was at first treated more tenderly, being placed in

(b) *The Garden in 'Edhen* (*vv.* 8–17). 8. The **garden**, as appears in the course of the story, was a tract of ground enclosed (iii. 23) and planted with trees of various kinds (*v.* 9); in other words, a park or orchard like those in which the ancient rulers of the Orient delighted. See Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 95 ff.; Ragozin, *Assyria*, 58. Such a park was called in Persian *pairidaeza*, whence, through the Greek, the English *Paradise*. The *garden of God*, or *Yahweh*, as it is sometimes called in other

* The author seems to have intended to represent the word אדם, *man*, as related to אדמה, *ground*. Comp. Brown, *Lex.*

† In the Babylonian document last cited, also, man precedes the beast of the field. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 40 f.; Ball, *LE*, 19.

parts of the Old Testament (Eze. xxviii. 13; Isa. li. 3), was located **in 'Edhen**. The 'Edhen here meant is not that of Am. i. 5 (Ehden ?), nor that of Isa. xxxvii. 12 and Eze. xxvii. 23 (Bit-adini). It has been sought in almost every part of the globe. The fact that the Hebrew of the name signifies *delight* in Ps. xxxvi. 9/8 has led to the suggestion that it is a poetical designation for a region with whose real name the author was not acquainted (Dillmann). Another and a more plausible theory is that it is derived from the Assyrian *edinu*, meaning *field*, which was sometimes used of the plain of Babylonia (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 79 f.). There is little to show where the author of this verse located the region he had in mind. What is said of the rivers that flowed from it is of doubtful value, since *vv.* 10–14 are clearly from another hand. It is here described as **eastward**; *viz.*, from the standpoint of the writer, Palestine.* The only passage that throws any real light on the subject is xi. 2, according to which 'Edhen must have been, not in Babylonia itself, but in the Arabian desert; since the sacred author there says that the people *journeyed eastward* to reach *the plain of the land of Shin'ar*. This location would harmonize with the latter of the two theories with reference to the original signification of the name *'Edhen*, the word *edinu* meaning *desert* as well as *plain*. See Schrader, *KAT*, 26 f. In this garden, wherever it was, Yahweh placed **the** single **man that he had formed**.

9. At the same time he **caused to spring from the ground** of the garden **every tree pleasant to sight**, to beautify the place (Eze. xxxi. 8, 16, 18), as well as all whose fruit is **good for** human **food**. In addition to all these ornamental and alimental trees, according to

* On the word מקדם, see iii. 24; xi. 2; xiii. 11.

the present text, there were **in the middle of the garden** two others. One of these was **the tree of life.** The tree is evidently so called to denote that its fruit possessed the property of preventing the decay and dissolution of the human body. This appears from iii. 22, where Yahweh is represented as using language implying that the first pair might, by means of the fruit of this tree, have prolonged their lives indefinitely. It is not clear whether they could have done so by eating of it but once, or only by resorting to it from time to time, as they felt the need of its rejuvenating potency. The fact that no reference is made to any attempt on their part to ensure their immortality by partaking of it, after their disobedience and before their expulsion from the garden, indicates that they could not thus have forestalled their Creator: in other words, that the fruit of this wonderful tree was intended to heal actual wounds and cure incipient diseases. The reason why they had not partaken of it, when they were expelled, therefore, is not that they knew nothing about it (Delitzsch), but that they had thus far had no occasion to test its efficacy. See Prv. iii. 18; xi. 30; xiii. 12; xv. 4; comp. Eze. xlvii. 12; Rev. xxii. 2. Such were the nature and the function of the tree of life, so far as they can be learned from the references to it in this and the following chapter. It is very doubtful, however, if this tree had a place in the original of the story in which it now appears; and for several reasons: (*1*) The idea which it represents does not harmonize with the teaching of the story as a whole; according to which man's life was given to him directly by Yahweh (*v.* 7), and remained immediately dependent on the will of the Creator (iii. 19; see also Ps. civ. 29). (*2*) It is completely ignored throughout almost the entire story. Thus, not only is there no reference to it in *v.* 17, but in

iii. 3 the language employed implies that there was only one tree in the middle of the garden. (*3*) The references to it have the marks of interpolations. Thus, in the verse under consideration, it obscures the author's meaning,* and iii. 22 and 24 evidently constitute a doublet to *v.* 23. These considerations seem to warrant one in concluding that the tree of life was wanting in the original story, and in restoring the text, if necessary, in harmony with this conclusion.† The tree of life being removed, there remains but one tree in the middle of the garden, **the tree of knowledge of good and evil**. The nature of this tree, also, is indicated by its name. It was a tree that possessed the property of imparting to those who did not have it the faculty of knowing good and evil. The meaning of the terms *good* and *evil* in this connection is disputed. Wellhausen (*GI*, 314) insists that the author here refers, not to a distinction in the moral quality of voluntary actions, but to a classification of things as helpful or harmful; in other words, that the knowledge of good and evil is only another name for culture, civilization. Budde (*BU*, 65 ff.) objects (*1*) that, granting that these terms originally had a purely utilitarian signification, when the Yahwistic narrative was written, they had evidently acquired a moral application (Am. v. 14 f.) which finally appears in expressions similar to, or identical

* The original author would certainly have introduced it after the phrase *in the middle of the garden*, and thus have made clear where the second tree was located.

† The required changes, which will be introduced in the proper connections, are the following: In 9b, for the present text, read *and, in the middle of the garden, the tree of knowledge of good and evil;* in 17a, for *knowledge of good and evil*, read, as in iii. 3, *that is in the middle of the garden;* and omit iii. 22 and 24. For an exhaustive discussion of the text, see Budde, *BU*, 46 ff.; comp. Bacon, *GG*, 104.

with, the one in question (2 Sam. xiv. 17; 1 Kgs. iii. 9); and (*2*) that, in the story of the Fall, the application to moral qualities is proven by the fact, that the first knowledge actually acquired by the first pair was that of their own nakedness. A still more convincing consideration is (*3*) that, in the threat attached to the prohibition of the tree in question, the capacity to distinguish between things advantageous and disadvantageous is taken for granted. What would have been the use of the declaration, *thou shalt die* (*v.* 17), if he to whom the words were addressed had no notion of the desirable as distinguished from the undesirable? The question, how the knowledge thus described was imparted is easily answered. It resided in the fruit of the tree; at any rate, it could be acquired by eating the fruit (iii. 7), and there is nothing to indicate that, to the mind of the author, it could be acquired in any other way. The theory that, if the first pair had not eaten of the forbidden fruit, the tree would have had any influence upon their moral condition (Delitzsch) is as gratuitous as to suppose that they could have satisfied their hunger by sitting in the shadow of the other trees of the garden.

10. The story of creation is here interrupted by a parenthetical description of a remarkable **river**. No name is given to it. It is introduced by the simple statement that it **went forth**, in a continuous flow, **from 'Edhen**, or, rather, an unknown point in the region thus designated. No reference is made to the creation of this stream; but the author describes it as **watering the garden**, and he evidently thought of it as provided for that purpose. As it issued from the garden **it branched and became four sources**, or the source of four diverging streams. It must therefore have been comparatively large.

11. The first of the streams to which the river of 'Edhen gave rise is called **Pishon**. The opinions with reference to its identity are numerous and conflicting. The earliest, which still is a favorite in some quarters, is that the author had in mind one of the rivers of India: *e. g.*, the Ganges (Josephus) or the Indus (Dillmann). Others seek it near the head-waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates, and find it in the Phasis (Brugsch), the Kyros (Keil), or the Araxes (von Raumer). Finally, those who locate the garden of 'Edhen in southern Babylonia identify the Pishon with one of the mouths of the Shatt el-Arab (Calvin), the Karun (Pressel), or a canal fed by the Euphrates. The last is the view maintained by Frd. Delitzsch (*WLP*, 45 ff.), who identifies it with a canal, the Pallakopas, which left the Euphrates below Babylon, and, after flowing through the Chaldean lakes and past the ancient city of 'Ur, emptied into the Persian Gulf some distance southwest of the mouth of the main stream, and still farther from that of the Tigris, which at that time entered the Gulf by a separate channel. Before attempting to decide which, if any, of these views is correct, it is necessary to locate the **land of Ḥawilah**,* of which the Pishon is said to have formed a boundary. The name occurs seven times (Gen. ii. 11; x. 7, 29; xxv. 18; 1 Sam. xv. 7; 1 Chr. i. 9, 23) in the Old Testament. In xxv. 18 it is given to the eastern limit of the territory occupied by the descendants of Ishmael, and, therefore, as Frd. Delitzsch (*WLP*, 58) contends, must have been in the vicinity of the upper end of the Persian Gulf. So, also, in 1 Sam. xv. 7. In Gen. x. 7 Ḥawilah is a son of Kuśh, or a Ḥamite tribe, while in *v.* 29 the same name is given to a son of Yoḳṭan, the second son of 'Ebher, from whom the Hebrews also were descended. It is not

* For החוילה read חֲוִילָה with the Samaritans.

necessary, in this connection, to decide whether the Ḥawilah of the latter passage is the same as that of the former, or a different tribe or country; or, if they are the same, whether they are identically located. It is clear that chapter x. is a compilation, that *vv.* 7 and 29 are by different authors, and that, since the latter only is from the same document as the second account of creation, and therefore at least possibly by the same hand, it alone can be given any weight in determining where the author of ii. 10–14 located Ḥawilah. But the sons of Yoḳṭan, so far as their identity can be discovered, were tribes or regions of Arabia. Hence the probability is that Ḥawilah also, according to the author of x. 29, was somewhere in that country. Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 341 ff.) has undertaken to show, not only that this interpretation is correct, but that the Pishon was Wady ed-Dawasir, one of the two great central wadies of the Arabian peninsula, a branch of which was formerly called Wady Faisan. See also Hommel, *AHT*, 313 ff. If, however, as seems probable, the Meśha of x. 30 is the Maśh of the Assyrian inscriptions (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 242 f.), *i. e.*, the great Syro-Arabian desert, or the northwestern part of it, Delitzsch's view, that the Pishon was a branch of the Euphrates, seems preferable. That this region produced **gold** appears from the fact that among the things brought as tribute to Tiglath-pileser III. by the king of Bit-yakin was "gold, the dust of his land." See Schrader, *KB*, ii. 14 f.

12. Of the gold of **that* land** the author says that it was **very† good**. Two other products of Ḥawilah are men-

* On the form הִוא see Ges. § 32, R 6. The Samaritans read הִיא.

† This is the reading of the Vulgate, as well as of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Massoretic text seems to have lost the adverb.

tioned. The word for the first has sometimes been rendered *pearl* (Bochart). The common opinion is that it is the name for **bdellium**, a transparent, aromatic gum, yellow in color, which, according to Pliny (*HN*, xii. 35), was found in Arabia, as well as in India, Media, and Babylonia. See Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 16; *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Bdellium;* comp. *Dic. Bib.* The third thing mentioned is a precious stone (Job xxviii. 16), found among the ornaments of the high priest's ephod (Ex. xxviii. 9, 20). It is supposed to be the same with the Assyrian *samtu*, the principal product of the Babylonian province of Meluḥa (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 60, 131). There are various opinions respecting its precise nature, but the oriental authorities identify it with the **beryl**, and this view is favored by many modern exegetes. See *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Beryl.*

13. The identity of the **Giḥon**, also, the second of the four streams into which the river of 'Edhen branched, is disputed. The ancients identified it with the Nile (Josephus), and their opinion in its various modifications still has its adherents (Dillmann). Others prefer the Oxus (Rosenmüller), which among Mohammedans has sometimes received the name Jeiḥun. Those who locate Paradise in Armenia identify the Giḥon with the Araxes (Brugsch), while those who find it in Babylonia prefer one of the mouths of the Shatt el-Arab (Calvin), the Kercha (Pressel), or a canal in that region. According to Frd. Delitzsch it was the Shatt en-Nil, a canal that left the Euphrates at Babylon, one of the branches of which emptied into the Tigris, while the other, after passing the ancient cities of Nippur and Uruk, finally reëntered the Euphrates not far from 'Ur (*WLP*, 70 f.), Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 354 f.) identifies it with wady er-Rumma, formerly Jaiḥan, in Northern Arabia. Here, again, the

author comes to the assistance of the reader by describing the river meant as **the one that boundeth the whole land of Kush**. Now Kush, in the Old Testament, usually denotes the country south of Egypt, the Ethiopia of classical geography, or some part of it, and this is the interpretation that has always been given to it in x. 6 f. In x. 8 ff., however, it cannot be so interpreted, but must at least include a part of Babylonia, where the cities mentioned in *v.* 10 were situated; and that passage, being of Yahwistic origin, doubtless indicates what is meant in this connection. It is probable, therefore, that Kush is here the name of a part, perhaps the whole, of Babylonia.* This being the case, it is further probable, that the name is but another form of the Assyrian *Kash*, a designation for a people whose earliest known home was on the border of Media, between Assyria proper and 'Elam,† but who finally overran both 'Elam and Babylonia, the latter of which they ruled for a period of at least four hundred years.‡ The river in question, therefore, must have been a branch of the Euphrates that bounded one of these regions; and the only known stream that fulfils these conditions seems to be the ancient canal identified with the Araḫtu of the

* The Greek Version here has Ethiopia, but in chapter x. a transliteration.

† Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 32. See also McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 142 ff. Hommel (*Dic. Bib.*, art. *Babylonia*) thinks that the Kasshites of Babylonia came from 'Elam, Kash being an ancient name for the latter country.

‡ This was the duration of the Kasshite supremacy according to Peiser (*ZA*, vi. 264 ff.), who fixes its limits at 1579 and 1180 B. C. See also Hommel *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Babylonia*. According to Frd. Delitzsch (Mürdter-Delitzsch, *GBA*, Appendix) it was considerably greater, — 1726–1150 B. C., — and according to Meyer (*GA*, i. 329) considerably less, — 1502–1257 B. C.

Assyrian inscriptions and the more modern Shatt en-Nil, whose pre-Shemitic name, according to Frd. Delitzsch (*WLP*, 75 f.), was Kaḥanna or Guḥanna.*

14. **The name of the third river is Ḥiddeḳel.** This is the Hebrew form of *Idiḳlat*, the name by which the Assyrians called the Tigris. It is described as flowing **east of 'Asshur**. If by 'Asshur were meant the city of that name, the earliest capital of Assyria, the statement would be perfectly correct, for it lay on the west bank of the Tigris, on the site of the modern village of Kalah Shergat. Since, however, the rivers heretofore mentioned were described in their relation to the countries that they bounded, it is more than probable that in this instance also the country, and not the city, 'Asshur is intended. This being the case, the author seems to be at fault, since Assyria lay on both sides of the Tigris, and the great cities, Kalaḥ, Nineweh, and Dur-sharruken, were east of it.† Still, the Tigris did flow east of the better known part of the Assyrian empire. A further difficulty arises from the fact that the Tigris is here represented as a branch of the same great stream as **the fourth river, the Perath**, *i. e.*, the Euphrates. This, also, taken in a strict sense is incorrect; for, although the two rise not far from each other, and flow only a few miles apart for some distance below the site of Sippara, they unite only after they have passed beyond the ancient limits of the Persian Gulf, which they once entered by

* How it came to be called the Nile is unknown. See Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 70 f.

† Dillmann and others prefer to translate קדמת, *in front of*; but this rendering is not supported by any of the other passages in which the word is used (iv. 16; 1 Sam. xiii. 5; Eze. xxxix. 11). Moreover, it is no improvement; since a river that flows *through* a country can with no greater propriety be said to flow *in front of*, than *east of* it.

separate channels (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 173 ff.). The only connection between them in early times was that made by canals such as the left branch of the Shatt en-Nil already mentioned. It seems necessary, therefore, to conclude, either that the author of *vv.* 10–14 lacked exact knowledge of Babylonia and its great rivers, or that he intended to represent the Tigris as, through the canal or canals connecting it with the Euphrates, a branch of the latter. The second of these suppositions is the more probable.

The idea that the river flowing forth from 'Edhen was the Euphrates is by no means modern. It has the sanction of the Talmud and other Jewish authorities (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 143 f.). According to Tosaphoth "the river of Paradise, before it begins to divide into four sources, is the Euphrates. When it divides, the others branch from it on either side, but it flows straight onward and forms in its course the fourth." * If this was the idea of the author of these verses, he cannot have located the garden in Arabia, but must have identified it with the country about Babylon, a region which was called, in the language of its non-Shemitic inhabitants, Karduniash, "the garden of the Lord of the lands." (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 64 ff., 133 ff.; McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 124 f., 133; comp. *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Eden;* Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 507 ff.)

15. Having described the river by which the garden was watered, the author of the description finds it necessary to repeat somewhat to restore the connection. He states once more, what has already been narrated of the man in *v.* 8, that Yahweh **placed him in the garden**.

* The Babylonians represented the Tigris and the Euphrates as the first rivers created. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 40 f.; Ball, *LE*, 19.

He, however, describes the place, not as *the garden in*, but as **the garden of 'Edhen**. He also states expressly that, as is implied in the connection of *v.* 8 with *v.* 5, the man was placed in the garden **to till it**. He adds a touch that hardly harmonizes with the original story, when he says that another object was, that he might **guard it**; for as yet he is the only living creature in existence, and the animals, when created, are to be his companions, and not his enemies.* Comp. Jub. iii. 13.

16f. The original story now proceeds with the statement that Yahweh, having created the trees as described in *v.* 9, **charged the man** with reference to them. The expression **all the trees of the garden**, of course, means all those described in *v.* 9 as *good for food;* or all but one, for one is expressly excepted. The present text describes it as **the tree of knowledge of good and evil**, but this can hardly be correct: for, (*1*) there being but one magical tree, it is more natural that it should be described by its location than by its properties; (*2*) it is so described in iii. 3; (*3*) the language of iii. 4 f. implies that the first pair were ignorant of its peculiar properties; and (*4*) the nature of the story requires that they should be so represented. See iii. 10 f.† Yahweh, therefore, must have forbidden the first man to eat of the fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden, without informing him what its effect would be and thus suggesting an inducement to disobedience. The reason for the prohibition has generally been overlooked. One suggestion is, that possibly it was only a temporary regulation; that perhaps

* Note also that the word גַּן, *garden*, is here feminine, but elsewhere (1 Kgs. xxi. 2; Isa. lviii. 11; Jer. xxxi. 12; Cnt. iv. 12, 16) masculine.

† The change in the text was made, and required, on account of the introduction of the tree of life in *v.* 9.

Yahweh would finally have permitted man to partake of the tree, if he had remained obedient, and secured him against evil consequences (Budde, *BU*, 72). The favorite opinion, however, is that, had the temptation been resisted, the result would have been the development in man, thus voluntarily choosing good, of a knowledge of the distinction between it and its opposite (Dillmann). Both of these views are clearly mistaken. The author evidently means to teach that man, when created, lacked the power to make for himself moral distinctions, and that Yahweh, although he made disappointment possible, intended that he should remain in this childlike condition (Piepenbring, *TOT*, 193 f.). To the further question, why Yahweh was unwilling that man should possess the knowledge of good and evil, also, there have been various answers. It is not clear that this author thought of the Creator as moved by jealousy in the matter. Neither iii. 5, where the serpent is the speaker, nor iii. 22, which is by another hand, can be cited in support of such a supposition. On the other hand, in view of xi. 6, it is hardly safe to say that he wished to represent the Deity as acting from purely benevolent motives. It is more probable that, in his mind, the ideal, and therefore the original, relation of man to God was one of absolute dependence, and that the latter, in denying to the former the knowledge of good and evil, was at the same time asserting his prerogative as Creator and attempting to safeguard the interests of his creature.* The prohibition was accompanied by a solemn warning. The words with which this is introduced, **in the day thou eatest from it**, might mean that the penalty threatened would immediately follow the offence (Gunkel), but the sequel shows

* On the jealousy attributed to their gods by other peoples, see Lenormant, *BH*, 104 ff.

that they are to be interpreted as equivalent to *if thou eatest thereof;* so that the whole clause might be freely rendered, *So* **surely** *as thou eatest thereof* **thou shalt die**, the emphasis being not on the date, so much as on the certainty, of the infliction. The serpent, in iii. 4, makes the ambiguity of this statement an excuse for a falsehood.

The natural question, how long the first man remained the solitary inhabitant of the earth, is left unanswered. The author can hardly have thought it a great length of time, for he proceeds at once to describe

(c) *The Advent of Woman* (*vv.* 18–25). 18. The account of her creation is introduced by a confession in which Yahweh is naïvely represented as, so to speak, feeling his way in his work. He says, **It is not good for the man to be alone**. Compare the satisfaction with which, in the first chapter, God is described as regarding the successive results of his creative activity, and the *very good* with which he finally characterizes the whole. On discovering that the provisions made for his creature are inadequate, Yahweh resolves to supply the deficiency. He says, **I will make** * **him a helper**, a sharer in his simple duties and their abundant rewards. This helper is to be one **suited to him**. Not his like, — it would have been a simple matter to have duplicated him, — but a second of his species in whom he will find himself complete.

19. In pursuance of his purpose Yahweh **further** †

* The Greek and the Latin Version have *Let us make.*

† The word rendered *further* (עוד), which, though not in the Massoretic text, is found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and its equivalent in the Greek Version, beyond doubt forbids a rendering of the verb by which it is made to appear that here, as in chapter i.,

formed from the ground, just as he had the man, three * classes of animals. The text does not say here, as in the case of the man, that life was imparted to the lifeless clay by the breath of Yahweh, but this was undoubtedly the author's idea. See Ps. civ. 29. The fish of the sea are ignored or overlooked, as in i. 30. The newly created animals Yahweh **brought to the man to see what he would call them**; gave him an opportunity to note their characteristics and put his ideas of them into appropriate names. In the first account it is God himself who gives names to his creatures as they are brought into existence. Note that the man, even before he had a companion, according to the author, had a perfect command of the original language of the race. The result was, that **whatsoever the man called each**, lit., *it*,† **that was**, became and still remains, **its name**.‡

20. One after another **all the cattle**, **all** § **the birds of heaven, and all the beasts of the field**, the last being the so-called wild animals (comp. *v.* 9), passed in procession before the man. As he gave them their names he sought among them the companion he needed,

the Creator *had formed* the animals before man existed. Comp. Murphy.

* The item **all the cattle** is to be supplied from *v.* 20. Before כל חית insert also, with the Samaritans, את, the sign of the accusative.

† The phrase *a living creature*, which follows in the Massoretic text, is without doubt a gloss introduced to prevent the possibility of a mistake with reference to the antecedent of the pronominal suffix.

‡ The Hebrew idea of the relation of names to the persons or things designated thereby is illustrated in the identification by them of the divine name with the Deity himself. See Isa. xxix. 23; l. 10; also Piepenbring, *TOT*, 141 f.

§ The word *all*, which is wanting in the Massoretic text, is supplied from the Greek Version.

but in vain; **for himself the man**, lit. *for the* man he*,† **found not a helper suited to him.**

21. The Creator, finding that none of the creatures he had produced from the ground was satisfactory, determined upon the use of a different material for the desired helper. In pursuance of his plan he threw the man into **a stupor**, and, when the latter **fell asleep**, removed **one of his ribs**; about the only bone that could be removed without mutilating the body.‡ In **its place** § he put **flesh.**

22. This rib Yahweh **fashioned**, lit. *built*, ‖ **into a**

* The Massoretes, not only here, but in iii. 17 and 21, omit the article; but, since in this and the following chapter, wherever the definiteness or indefiniteness of the noun can be determined from the consonantal text, the article is used, it is more than probable that in these cases the proper reading is not לְאדם, *for 'Adham*, or *for a man* (Delitzsch), but לָאדם, *for the man*, *i. e.*, the first man.

† Two other renderings have been suggested: *one found not*, or *there was not found*, as in the Greek and (Revised) English versions; and *he* (Yahweh) *found not* (Dillmann). Both of them, however, require a change of subject which is awkward and improbable. Olshausen suggests the reading והאדם for ולאדם.

‡ The word צלע also means *side*. In fact, this is the sense in which it is most frequently found. See Ex. xxv. 12, 14, etc. Hence some have insisted on rendering it so in this connection. See *Ber. Rab.* 75 f.; also Lenormant (*BH*, 60 ff.), who cites Persian and Indian legends in support of his interpretation. This, however, cannot have been the thought of the author, since he would not have represented the first being created as wanting what he already possessed. It should also be noted, that the Assyrian equivalent of צלע, *ṣilu*, means *rib* as well as *side*.

§ On תחתנה, lit. *under it*, see Ges. § 103, 1, R 3. The Samaritans have the regular form תהתיה.

‖ There is a peculiar fitness in the use of בנה, *build*, in this connection, arising from the fact that צלע is sometimes found in the sense of *board*. See 1 Kgs. vi. 15.

woman, and brought her to the man, to see if he would recognize in her the needed companion.

23. Yahweh must at the same time have explained the origin of the woman. The language in which the man welcomed her implies such an explanation: **This, now**, unlike all the previous products of the divine skill, **is one of my bones and a part of my flesh**; lit. *bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh;* part and parcel of myself. He at once proceeds to name her, as he had previously named the animals presented to him. He calls her **woman**, and gives as a reason for so naming her, that **she was taken* from her† man**, her husband.‡

24. **Therefore**, because the first wife was literally, according to this account, a part of her husband. The words that follow are probably the words of the first man, not, like x. 9b, an explanation interjected by the narrator (Dillmann). Comp. Mat. xix. 5. Hence they are to be rendered **shall**, and not *doth* **a man leave his father and his mother**, loose to a greater or less extent the ties by which he is bound to them, **and cleave**, as to no other, **to his wife**. See Ps. xlv. 11/10. Thus **the two**§ are to **become one flesh**, their aims and interests thenceforth being identical. This verse, taken in connection with iii. 16, indicates that the author regarded

* On the form לָקְחָהּ see Ges. § 52, 1, R.

† This is the Greek and the Samaritan reading; the Massoretic text omits the pronominal suffix.

‡ The writer seems to have derived the Hebrew word for *woman*, אִשָּׁה, from אִישׁ, *man;* and this was formerly supposed to be the correct derivation. See, however, Brown, *Lex.* 35b; Frd. Delitzsch, *HA*, 9.

§ This is the Greek, the Syriac, and the Vulgate reading. The Massoretic text omits שְׁנֵיהֶם, *they two;* the Samaritan has וְהָיָה מִשְׁנֵיהֶם, *and there shall be from the two of them.*

the equality of the husband and the wife as the ideal relation between them, but it does not so clearly as some have supposed (Dillmann) imply that he disapproved of polygamy. See iv. 19.

25. The account closes with a statement in harmony with the conception, evidently cherished by the author, that the first representatives of the human race were as immature, and therefore as irresponsible, as children. Though **they were both naked,* they felt no shame**; saw no more harm in exposing their persons to each other than as if they had been infants.

In the course of the comments on this second account of creation sufficient stress has been laid upon the variations between it and the first to show that the two cannot be the work of the same author. They diverge, as is now generally conceded, both in style and, in large measure, in content. There is, however, a fundamental unity between them. They both, so far as they go, trace the origin of all things to the will of an intelligent Creator; and they both make man the chief of God's creatures and the lord of the earth and everything in it. The difference between them, so far as these fundamentals are concerned, is merely a difference in the degree of clearness with which the common ideas are conceived and taught. When the second account was written, they were rather implied than expressed; by the time the first appeared they had become recognized doctrines of the Jewish church.

The condition and surroundings of the first pair, according to the Yahwist, were perfect. The garden yielded all that they needed to satisfy their physical wants. The

* On ערומים, *naked*, see Ges. § 9, (2) R.

exertion required of them was enough to give zest to existence, but too little to be called labor. They lived at peace with the animals, one and all, and in delightful communion with each other. How long this state of things lasted, the author does not say.* He seems to have meant to give the impression that no great length of time elapsed before it was disturbed; for he proceeds at once to describe

b. The Origin of Evil (iii.).

He explains the existence of physical suffering and death as the penalty for

(1) The First Disobedience (*vv.* 1–7). 1. The presence of the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the garden, in view of its attractiveness, was in itself a temptation. This, however, was not sufficient. The force of the divine prohibition, which would naturally operate to prevent disobedience, must in some way be neutralized. This is accomplished through the intervention of **the serpent**. The question, Who, or what, was the serpent, has been variously answered. It has been interpreted as an allegorical figure. Thus, Reuss (*AT*, iii. 206 f.) makes it a personification of the instinct that impels man to emerge from the condition of childhood, while Schultz (*OTT*, ii. 272 ff.) holds that it symbolizes the animal principle in mankind. The objection to the first of these views is, that it neither attempts nor permits an explanation of the curse pronounced upon the serpent. The second is still less satisfactory; for (*1*) the author of the story evidently did not distinguish between two or more species of life in man, but thought of it in its entirety as a manifestation of the spirit of Yahweh in the human form (ii. 7; vi. 3); (*2*) on the supposition that he made

* According to the Book of Jubilees (iii. 12) it was seven years.

such a distinction, the serpent could not symbolize the animal life, since, although the woman herself notes the beauty of the tree and the attractiveness of its fruit, the serpent takes no account of these things, but presents the higher advantages to be obtained by partaking of it (iii. 5); and (*3*) this view renders the author's statement concerning the penalties inflicted confusing and unintelligible. A favorite theory is that the serpent was a mask for Satan. It is at least as old as the book of Wisdom (ii. 23 f.; see also Rom. xvi. 20; Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2; but comp. 2 Cor. xi. 3). Some modern exegetes (Delitzsch) are very strenuous in their insistence upon it; but it cannot be maintained. (*1*) There is nowhere in the language used any evidence that a concealed personality was in the mind of the writer. (*2*) Granted that the serpent was a mask for another being, there would still be the best of ground for denying that this hypothetical being was Satan: for (*a*) the doctrine of Satan as an evil power opposed to the Deity is considerably later than the date of the origin of this story (comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 and 1 Chr. xxi. 1); and (*b*) the introduction of a positively evil being would have forestalled the very object of the story, to explain the origin of evil in the world. (*3*) This interpretation, also, like the allegorical, breaks down when applied to the penalty inflicted on the serpent; for, either (*a*) the serpent alone is punished and the power of which it was the tool overlooked, or (*b*) Satan is condemned to a degradation which hardly harmonizes with his subsequent position as a son of God and a member of the heavenly court. See Job i. 6. If, now, the serpent is neither a figure of thought nor a mask for Satan, the presumption is that it is to be understood as a real animal. That this is the correct interpretation appears from the following considerations: (*1*) It

is distinctly classified among the beasts of the field, *i. e.*, the animals (ii. 19), or, strictly speaking, the so-called wild animals (ii. 20). (*2*) It is described by a mark, cunning, that belongs, or has always been popularly supposed to belong, to actual serpents. See Mat. x. 16. (*3*) The object of the author required the introduction of a tempter without moral responsibility. (*4*) The penalty inflicted upon the serpent (*v.* 14) exactly fits the animal of that name and corresponds to those inflicted upon the man and the woman. To the objection that it is ridiculous to suppose the serpent ever to have had the power of speech or any other form than it now wears, it is sufficient to reply that the question now is, not what were the original form and capacities of this animal, but how the author of the story conceived of it. The early Jews had no difficulty with the literal interpretation. They seem to have believed that all the animals had the power of speech (Jub. iii. 24), and that the serpent went erect on two feet (*Ber. Rab.*). The animal, if it was an animal, is described as **most * cunning of all the beasts of the field**. The epithet *cunning* does not imply moral obliquity, but denotes simply that this animal had to a larger degree than any other the kind of intelligence that is popularly attributed also to the fox. See Lu. xiii. 32. The serpent exemplifies its character by the way in which it approaches the woman; coming to her, apparently, when she happens to be alone and saying,† **Hath God, then, said?** Note the name for the Deity. The form of address is half-exclamatory, as if the serpent can hardly believe what it is about

* The construction מִכֹּל, though comparative in form, is superlative in signification, and should be so rendered in English. See Deu. vii. 7, etc.; König, *SHS*, § 309, d.

† In the Massoretic text the subject of the verb אָמַר, *said*, has to be supplied from the connection. A better reading is that of the Greek and Syriac versions, in which *the serpent* is expressed. So Ball.

to put into the mouth of God. Its version of the divine injunction is calculated to excite astonishment, being a reckless and incredible perversion of the original utterance. Yahweh had forbidden one tree; the serpent pretends to have learned that he has forbidden all of them. **Ye shall not eat of any** * **tree of the garden**, is its way of putting it. Comp. Murphy.

2. The woman's reply is interesting in several respects. In the first clause she denies the serpent's statement, reproducing, with unimportant variations, ii. 16b.†

3. As she proceeds, she diverges from the phraseology of ii. 17. The tree whose fruit is forbidden is designated, not by the name given to it in ii. 9 and 17, but, as it should be on the supposition that it was the only one there, by its location, as **this** ‡ **tree that is in the middle of the garden.** From the fruit of this tree the woman explains that she and her husband have been forbidden to eat on pain of death; but she enlarges upon the original injunction as reported in ii. 16 f. by the insertion of an additional clause. This clause can hardly be a thoughtless variation. It was doubtless intended to indicate the first effect upon the woman of the serpent's insinuation. It has given rise to a sense of injury, to justify which she converts what was at most an implication of the original charge into an express prohibition, **nor shall ye touch it lest ye die.**§

4. This reference to Yahweh's threat furnished the serpent a second opportunity for the exhibition of its cun-

* On the force of כל with the negative, see Ex. xx. 10; Ges. § 152, 1, a.

† The word כל, here *all*, which is wanting in the Massoretic text, is to be supplied from the Greek and Syriac versions, both of which, however, omit פרי, *fruit*.

‡ The Samaritan reading; the Massoretic has *the*.

§ On the form תמתון, see Ges. § 47, 3, R 4.

ning. In ii. 17 Yahweh had said, *In the day thou eatest from it thou shalt surely die.* The woman seems to have understood these words as meaning that death would be the direct and immediate effect of eating of the forbidden fruit. This, as the sequel shows, was a mistaken interpretation; yet the serpent adopted it, thus making its reply, **Ye will not** * **surely die**, at the same time strictly correct and utterly misleading, since the natural inference would now be, that disobedience of the divine command would have no evil consequences.

5. Having thus artfully disposed of the woman's fears, the serpent proceeds to inform her what are the real properties of the tree in question. At the same time it takes pains to increase the distrust of Yahweh awakened by its first utterance. The words with which it introduces its statement imply, not only, as *v.* 3 would lead one to suspect, that both the man and his wife had hitherto been ignorant of the nature of the tree, but that God had purposely kept them in ignorance of it, and from a sinister motive. **God knoweth**, it says, **that in the day ye eat from it your eyes will be opened**. What is meant by the opening of their eyes is at once explained: **Ye will be like God**, not gods (Spurrell), **knowing good and evil**; which could not but seem to the woman highly advantageous.

6. The tree, thus skilfully commended, now became very attractive. The woman **saw**, first, that it, or its fruit, was apparently **good**, fit, **for food**. This she seems not hitherto to have noticed; much less that it was **a delight to the eyes**, looking as if it would be, not only nutritious, but delicious. Finally, she was convinced that

* On the position of the negative, see Ges. § 113, 3, R 3, where, however, the parenthetical clause should read, "where the object is the denial *verbatim* of the threat uttered in ii. 17."

it was **desirable**, because, as the serpent had expressly, and correctly, told her, the effect of eating from it was **to make one wise**, to communicate a knowledge hitherto denied. Comp. Delitzsch.* The last was the determining factor. The desire to become like God, a present advantage, overcame the fear of his displeasure, a future, and now at the most only a possible disadvantage; and, approaching the tree, **she took from its fruit and ate**. Then **she gave also to her husband**. It is not clear that the author thought of the woman as giving the fruit to her husband with the idea of dividing the responsibility of transgressing the divine command (Dillmann). The serpent had, as she understood it, assured her that there was no danger, and she herself had learned by testing it that the fruit did not, as she had supposed it would, produce harmful physical effects. It is therefore more natural to suppose that she acted upon an impulse to share with her husband the good that she had coveted. The phrase **with her** is usually understood as meaning that he was present when she finally yielded to the tempter. This, in view of the fact that he has no place or part in the scene between his wife and the serpent, can hardly be correct. If, therefore, the present text is retained, these words must be interpreted as equivalent to *as well*, denoting that, when she found him, or he her, she gave him his share of the fruit that she had plucked,† **and he ate**.‡ This view of the matter is supported by the fact that, according to *vv.* 12 and 17, the woman alone is accused of tempting her husband.

* If the rendering preferred by Delitzsch, *lovely to behold*, be adopted, one can hardly avoid the conclusion of Gunkel, that this last phrase is a gloss to the one preceding.

† The Arabic Version obtains a more intelligible reading by placing this phrase at the end of the verse. So Ball.

‡ The Greek and Samaritan reading has the plural, *they ate*.

7. The result was just what the serpent had predicted ; **the eyes of both of them were opened**, *i. e.*, they acquired the coveted power to distinguish for themselves between good and evil. This power at once manifested itself in the recognition of the fact that **they were naked**. The consciousness of their condition produced an emotion which has usually been identified with shame in the sense of guilty confusion (Dillmann). It is doubtful if this was the author's meaning. His idea seems to have been that the pair were at first so preoccupied with the operation of the new faculty that they felt no condemnation for the act by which they had acquired it. The emotion produced by the consciousness of their nakedness, therefore, must have been the natural disturbance at being discovered naked which is perfectly consistent with innocence. It prompted them to clothe themselves, and, in obedience to this normal impulse, **they sewed together fig-leaves and made themselves aprons**. The smallness and irregularity of the leaves of the *ficus carica* do not warrant one in supposing that the tree here meant was one of another species ; *e. g.*, the banana (Delitzsch). The fig probably has its place in the story because the author, who thereby perhaps betrays his Palestinian origin (Dillmann), thought of it as the tree with which, through their use of its fruit for food, the man and his wife were best acquainted.* The suggestion of Budde (*BU*, 69 f.), that the use of fig-leaves for the purpose described betrays their helplessness, is less attractive.

If, as has been suggested, the offending pair, at first, being preoccupied with the new faculty and its operation,

* According to some Jewish authorities the tree of knowledge of good and evil was the fig. See Weber, *PT*, 212.

forgot Yahweh and his warning, they were soon reminded of their responsibility to him and confronted with

(2) The Consequences of Disobedience (*vv.* 8–21). 8. While, as it would seem, they were engaged in providing themselves with a covering for their nakedness, **they heard Yaweh**, lit. *the voice of Yaweh*, **walking**, taking his pleasure ; **in the garden**, his garden as well as theirs ; **in the cool of the day**, just at evening, when one would naturally take such exercise (xxiv. 63). Here the author apparently attributes to God a ponderable form and parts, like those of human beings. When they heard him, **the man and his wife hid themselves among the trees in the garden**. What prompted them thus to try to elude their Creator ? The usual answer is, A sense of guilt because they had disobeyed his command ; but see *v.* 10.

9. After a little, Yahweh, not finding them as readily as usual, **called the man**, as one man would call another, saying, **Where art thou ?** The question calls not so much for information with respect to the man's whereabouts as for an explanation of his disappearance.

10. The man, hearing the voice of his Maker, at once presents himself to give the desired explanation. **I became afraid**, he says, **because I was naked**. This statement is often interpreted as a mere pretext (Holzinger), and utilized as an illustration of the rapidity of the descent from innocence to depravity. It is very doubtful, however, if the author intended that it should be so understood. In the first place, he had too great knowledge of human nature to represent the Fall as so precipitate, and, secondly, he had too much feeling for literary effect to prefer a less, to a more, dramatic conception of his subject. See xxvi. 7 ff. ; xliv. 1 ff. The story gains in interest as well as naturalness on the sup-

position that the man, surprised in the midst of a new experience before he has time for reflection, is giving the real reason for his flight ; in other words, is registering a second instance of the normal operation of the newly acquired faculty. The *naïveté* with which he is thus made to betray himself is, from a literary standpoint, one of the finest features of the story.

11. The climax is reached in the next question,* **Who told thee thou wast naked?** At these words the man begins to realize what he has done, and his confusion at first renders him speechless. Indeed he does not venture to speak until forced to do so by the sterner demand, **Hast thou eaten from the tree from which I commanded thee not to eat?**

12. The mention of the interdict upon the tree of knowledge of good and evil recalled the threat by which it was accompanied, and filled the man with fear. When overcome by terror, men often do things unworthy of them. This first one is represented as seeking to save himself by inculpating his wife. Perhaps, also, the words attributed to him imply a disposition to make Yahweh himself partially responsible for his disobedience. They are, **The woman thou placedst with me**, gavest me as an associate, **gave me from the tree and I ate**.

13. The woman, in her turn, when called to account, seeing that her tempter had told her but half the truth, said, **The serpent beguiled me and I ate**.

14. The examination ended, Yahweh proceeds to pass sentence upon the offenders, beginning with the serpent. In his first utterance he declares in general terms that it shall be **cursed**, not only above **all cattle**, but above all the rest of the class, **beasts of the field**, to which, ac-

* The Syriac Version supplies as subject the equivalent of *Yahweh*.

cording to *v.* 1, it properly belongs.* It is to be the least favored of animals. The implication is that it was previously one of the most favored. It is to be degraded in its form and habits. The decree is, **On thy belly shalt thou go**. At this time, therefore, according to the author, the serpent, of whose original shape there is no hint, by the divine fiat became the limbless, wriggling creature since known by its name. Comp. Strack. The clause **dust shalt thou eat**, is merely a development of the one preceding. It does not mean that the serpent will henceforth live on dust, or dirt, but that, by its method of locomotion, it will be compelled to swallow more or less of the substance in which it moves. See Mic. vii. 17; comp. Isa. lxv. 25. The phrase touching the duration of the penalty, **all the days of thy life**, can only mean as long as the species exists. See *v.* 15.

15. The worst of the curse is still to come. Yahweh continues: **I will also set enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy offspring**, the whole serpent family, **and her offspring**, the entire human race. Thus, according to the author, originated the antipathy, which he regarded as natural and universal, between men and snakes. When, therefore, he says **they**, mankind, **shall bruise thee**, he means, not the individual animal addressed, — for, if it were bruised **in the head**, the feud would be ended, — but its offspring. So, also, it is the offspring of the serpent that is to **wound** † mankind **in the heel**. The fact that it is the

* Here, again, the word *other* must be supplied to complete the meaning of the Hebrew author in English.

† The meaning of שׁוּף, the word here rendered *wound*, is disputed. Delitzsch insists that it can only mean *bruise*. Dillmann, following the Greek Version, gives it the force of שׁאַף, *aim at* (*trachten nach*). Holzinger suspects that it, as well as שׁאַף, has both meanings, and that in this case it should be rendered, first by

head of the serpent which is to be bruised, and the heel of mankind that is to be wounded, has led many to suppose that the triumph of the offspring of the woman over the serpent's is here predicted (Luther). This, however, is not the case. The head of the serpent is specified because that is the part of the animal where an injury is most effective ; and the heel of the human species because that is the only part within easy reach of their adversary : but a blow on the head is no more serious to the serpent than a poisonous wound in the heel to its hereditary enemy. There is thus no intimation with respect to the outcome of the feud, unless it be in the fact that the enmity between the parties is represented as a penalty inflicted upon the serpent. On the justice of this infliction it is enough to say that the Hebrews saw no cruelty in putting to death a beast that was dangerous to man. See Ex. xxi. 28 ff.

16. Turning now to the woman, Yahweh passes sentence upon her.* She has hitherto known only the free and agreeable play of the forces implanted in her nature. The author evidently believed that, had she

bruise and then by *pant for*, or a similar term. See the Vulgate. Fürst also supposes it to have a twofold signification, but he, recalling the Syriac *shaphyah*, *sting*, makes the second *pierce*. So the Syriac Version. The second and third of these views are untenable, because they do not harmonize with the apparent aim of the author to explain, not only the mutual hatred existing between men and serpents, but the positive injuries which they are thereby prompted to inflict upon one another. Either of the other two seems defensible, that of Fürst being most attractive. It is not impossible that in the second clause תשופנו is a mistake for תשכנו, from נשך, *bite*, *sting*, which would be the usual expression in such a connection. See xlix. 17.

* The connective ו here rendered *but*, is supplied from the Samaritan text, which is followed by the Greek Version.

resisted the tempter, she would have remained ignorant of suffering, even in childbirth; that, in fact, suffering was now introduced into the world as a punishment for her disobedience. This is what is meant, when Yahweh says, **I will send thee labor very sore.*** There follows what seems to be a gloss inserted to prevent mistake with reference to the meaning of the ambiguous word *labor*, which is used in a different sense in *v.* 18.† The addition **even thy pregnancy**, however, was hardly necessary, since the next clause explains that the **labor** ‡ intended is that of childbirth. The curse pronounced upon the woman, like that imposed upon the serpent, is twofold, and the second part is here, as in the former case, a change of relation. She was created the equal of her husband (ii. 24), and thus far she has consistently been so represented; but now Yahweh says, **thy longing** § **shall be toward thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.** The term *longing* is generally inter-

* A literal rendering would be, *I will greatly multiply thy labor:* but this might be understood as implying that Ḥawwah had already had some experience in suffering, which the author would certainly not have admitted. The translation given above precludes such a misunderstanding.

† On the construction of הרנך, or, as the Samaritans read, הריונך, comp. Ges. § 154, n. b. Gunkel, following the Greek Version, amends the text by substituting הגיונך, *thy sighing*, or יגונך, *thy pain*.

‡ For עצב read, with the Samaritans, עצבון. So Ball.

§ This is the reading of the Massoretic text, but instead of תשוקתך the Greek and Syriac versions have the equivalent of תשובתך, *thy return;* and Ball, following Nestle, adopts the latter, citing in support of his opinion 2 Sam. xvii. 3, where, according to Driver (*HTS*, 248 f.), the correct reading is, *as a bride returneth to her husband.* Note, however, that in Cant. vii. 11/10, where the versions again appear to have read תשובתך for תשוקתך, *return* in the sense of 2 Sam. xvii. 3 is anything but appropriate.

preted as meaning sexual desire, to which the author is supposed to have intended to represent women as peculiarly subject. This interpretation, however, is not entirely satisfactory. The word here used is found in only two other places in the Old Testament, iv. 7 and Cant. vii. 11/10. In the former of these passages, if it means anything, it must mean *inclination*, or something equally removed from sensuality; and in the latter, where a man is the subject, it has the force of *affection, devotion.* There is therefore ground for the opinion that the author, in this passage, intended to make Yahweh say that the very tenderness of the woman for her husband would enable him to make and keep her his inferior. Whichever of these views is adopted, it should not be overlooked, that the change in the nature and destiny of the woman here described is not an effect produced by the forbidden fruit or the act of disobedience, but a penalty chosen freely by Yahweh after the offence had been committed. Comp. Delitzsch.

17. Last of all **the man** * receives his sentence. It is none the lighter for the excuse he offered. **Because thou hast listened to the voice of thy wife**, says Yahweh. This means, what was taken for granted in the case of the woman, that temptation, while it may explain, does not excuse transgression. It is interesting to notice that even here the forbidden tree is not described by its properties, but as **the tree concerning which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat from it**. The penalty is, **cursed shall be the ground on thy account**; because of thy disobedience, and for its punishment. The rest is explanatory. The earth, or that part of it occupied by the first pair, had hitherto produced abundantly, and seemingly without the necessity of

* This is the Greek reading; the Massoretic text has *'Adham.*

fatiguing effort on their part. The man, at least, is now to be required to exert himself, and that painfully, that he may obtain the means of subsistence. In his case the very ground has become an enemy, and in his case also there is to be no end to the struggle; **with pain shalt thou eat from it**, lit. *eat it*, **all the days of thy life.** Here, as in the case of the serpent, the individual addressed represents his kind. The last phrase, therefore, means as long as the race endures.

18. In the preceding verse the author doubtless intended to convey the idea that, on account of the man's transgression, Yahweh then and there diminished the fertility of the earth. He now further represents the Creator as decreeing that it shall henceforth be infested with **thorns and thistles**, the most noxious of weeds, which not only divide the productive power of the soil with useful plants, but hinder the latter from securing their share of nourishment. Heretofore there had been nothing of this kind. The full significance of this item appears with the further announcement that henceforth man must eat **the herb of the field**, the smaller plants or their fruits. According to i. 29, God, immediately upon creating man, gave him *every herb yielding seed that is on the face of the whole earth* as well as *all the trees*, for his sustenance. This author evidently believed that man originally lived from the fruits of trees, and that the use of grains, etc., for food, and the toil necessary to produce them under existing conditions, were a reminder of God's displeasure with the first of the race.*

19. In *v.* 17 the strenuousness of the toil imposed upon the man was indicated by the use of the same word for it that was used in *v.* 16 for the suffering of the woman

* The above interpretation, if correct, makes it improbable that, as Holzinger suggests, 18b is a gloss.

in childbirth. The same thing is now pictured in its most familiar external manifestation. **In the sweat of thy face**, says Yahweh, **shalt thou eat bread**. He adds, **until thou return to the ground**.* These words, besides repeating the idea already expressed at the close of *v.* 17, introduce the curse for which, as it now appears, the others were, not substitutes, but a preparation. Yahweh at last makes good his threat: **dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return**. The sentence is addressed to the man, but it applies also to the woman. Indeed, as in the previous cases, it is a hereditary infliction. As a penalty for the act by which the first pair transgressed his command, Yahweh ordains that their bodies, and the bodies of their descendants, shall finally dissolve and mingle with the earth of which they were originally a part. When the sentence is to be executed, and what is to become of the spirit thus released, — to these questions, for the present at least, the author has no answer.

20. This verse has not the slightest connection with the preceding. In fact, it interrupts the connection and introduces discord into the story. Would the author of it have represented **the man** † as replying to his death warrant by jauntily renaming his wife **Ḥawwah**, Life? The proper occasion for such a change was after the birth of her first child, when she might appropriately have been described as **the mother of every one living**. Hence the verse, if it is to have any significance, must be inserted after iv. 1.‡

* The added words, **for from it thou wast taken**, have the appearance of a gloss.

† The Samaritan reading is *'Adham*.

‡ So Bacon (*GG*, 104), who refers it to J. Comp. Budde, *BU*, 60. It would make sense also if inserted after iii. 25 in its original form.

21. This section of the story closes with a statement that somewhat relieves the severity of the preceding verses. Yahweh, presumably out of pity for the helplessness of his unhappy creatures, **made for the man** * **and his wife tunics of skin**, to take the place of the aprons that they had made, or were making, for themselves, **and clothed them**. Since there is no hint of a change in climatic conditions, the object of Yahweh in providing these first clothes must have been to satisfy the demands of modesty. The mention of skins, which could only be obtained by the slaughter of animals, as the material out of which the garments were made, suggests several interesting questions: What was done with the flesh of the slaughtered animals? Was it eaten by the man and his wife in apparent contradiction with *v.* 18, or sacrificed to Yahweh? If the latter was the case, was this the first instance of sacrifice, or had the custom existed from the beginning? In other words what was the author's idea of the significance of sacrifice? He gives no clew to a reliable answer to any of these questions in this connection.

(3) Expulsion from Paradise (*vv.* 22–24). This part of the story was originally told in a single verse, but in the present text the conclusion has been expanded into a separate scene, laid partly in heaven and partly on earth, by the addition of a duplicate of the original version in which the tree of life reappears.

22. Yahweh is first represented as considering with his angels the best method of dealing with his disobedient creatures. The act committed has already been reported. The scene opens with a statement of the situation, **Lo, the man has become as one of us, knowing good**

* This is the Greek reading; the Massoretic text has '*Adham*.

and evil. This statement leaves no room for the interview between Yahweh and the offenders just described. It also betrays the jealousy that the serpent, falsely, it is safe to suppose, imputed to the Creator. The rest of the verse is in a similar strain, the reason assigned for driving the man from the garden being, **lest he take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever.** In other words, Yahweh seems more concerned to frustrate the ambition of his creature than to maintain his own authority. The last sentence is incomplete, lacking a protasis, which would read, *let us drive him from the garden*, etc.

23. The continuation of *v.* 22 is found in *v.* 24. These two verses are separated by the simple statement with which, as has been intimated, the story originally concluded, **then Yahweh sent him from the garden of 'Edhen** * **to till the ground whence he was taken.** Thus was begun the execution of the sentence which was to end in death.†

24. This verse describes the removal of the man from the garden in sterner terms than those of *v.* 23. It says the man was **driven forth**, and that, to keep him out, Yahweh **stationed eastward of the garden of 'Edhen**, where the entrance was located, **cherubs.**‡ The various

* The phrase *the garden of 'Edhen* occurs elsewhere in the story only in ii. 15, which is probably editorial, the original author always (ii. 16; iii. 1, 2, 3, 8 *bis*, 10) saying simply *the garden*. The descriptive term *of 'Edhen* is here, therefore, probably a gloss. See *v.* 24.

† Compare Holzinger, who pronounces at least the last half of this verse an interpolation in contradiction with *vv.* 17–19, although the final clause is a recapitulation of *v.* 19.

‡ The Greek version has *he caused him* (man) *to dwell eastward of the garden of 'Edhen, and set the cherubs*, etc., and Ball adopts this reading; but it can hardly represent the original text. In the

references to cherubs in the Old Testament are of two classes: (*1*) those in which they act as throne-bearers to Yahweh (Ps. xviii. 11/10; Eze. x. 1 ff.), and (*2*) those in which they serve as guardians of sacred places (Ex. xxv. 18 ff.; 1 Kgs. vi. 23 ff.; Eze. xxviii. 14 ff.). The passage now under consideration clearly belongs to the latter of these classes. It is not, however, necessary to suppose that in all cases of this sort the conception is identical. Cheyne (*Enc. Bib.*) supposes the cherub to have been of Hittite origin and originally to have had the fabulous form of the griffin; but, since the narrative to which this verse belongs, especially in its later portions, betrays Assyrian influence, it is probable that the cherubs here meant were winged bulls, like those by which the entrances to Assyrian (and Elamitic) temples and palaces were flanked, and to which the name *kirubu*, as well as *shedu*, was sometimes applied. See Eze. x. 14, where *cherub* takes the place of the *ox* of i. 10; also Ball, *LE*, 31 ff.; Lenormant, *BH*, 117 ff.; Schrader, *KAT*, 39 ff.; Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 150 ff.; comp. *Dic. Bib.* There was a second obstacle to the man's return in **a gleaming, whirling sword**, cutting and thrusting this way and that, not in the hand of one of the cherubs, but probably between them in the very entrance to the garden.* Thus carefully did Yahweh **guard the way to the tree of life.**

first place, it impedes the flow of the author's thought; further, it is unlike the author of *vv.* 22 and 23 to introduce such a touch of consideration for man; and finally, it is easily accounted for by supposing that either the Greek translator or a copyist before him, recalling xi. 2, first mistook the object of the only verb in the clause and then supplied a synonymous verb to govern the following accusatives.

* On this weapon see the ingenious discussion of Lenormant, *BH*, 136 ff.

The story of the Fall in its Hebrew form was clearly intended to be taken literally; hence the interpretation adopted in the foregoing comments. It is possible that some who admit the correctness of this method of interpreting it will continue to regard it as veritable history, but most thoughtful people will feel obliged to question or deny the correctness of the account of the origin of evil here given. Those who accept this result, however, need not reject the story as worthless, and therefore unworthy of a place in the Scriptures; for, although it is not historically valuable, the religious ideas it inculcates, especially in view of the antiquity of their origin, are remarkable for their excellence. It teaches, naïvely but forcibly, the sovereignty as well as the beneficence of God, the freedom and responsibility of man, and the dependence of human happiness upon obedience to the divine will. It is these ideas that have given the story its real value in the past, and, if properly emphasized, they will make it, to those who read the Bible for edification, equally helpful in the future.*

The exit of the first pair from the garden marks the beginning, according to the Hebrews, of a new period in the history of the world, a period of rapid development in two directions. The exiles had taken their first step in the arts of civilization when they undertook to provide themselves with clothing. Their immediate descendants, seeking relief from the hard conditions under which they had been condemned to live, displayed their superiority to their brute companions in other similar achievements. The development in this direction, however, as the record is now constituted, is more or less obscured by the promi-

* On an alleged Babylonian parallel to the story of the Fall, see Boscawen, *BM*, 85 ff.; Ryle, *ENG*, 39 ff.; comp. Schrader, *KAT*, 37 f.

nence given to the growing alienation of the race from God during the same period. The first sin, although, so far as can be learned from the record, it did not disorganize human nature, as it has sometimes been represented to have done, and although the ills by which it was punished remained as a warning against further offences, was followed by others, until the race became a race of evil-doers. This period may therefore be called the period of

2. Early Growth and Corruption (iv. 1–vi. 8).

The composite history of it first follows

a. The Line of Ḳayin (iv. 1–24),

the account of which is largely devoted to

(1) The First Murder (*vv.* 1–16). The first verse of this passage and parts of *v.* 16 are generally attributed to the author of the story of the Fall; the rest of it, owing to discrepancies with the preceding and following context, is supposed to be the work of another hand.* The occasion of this first crime was

(a) *A Rejected Offering* (*vv.* 1–7). 1. The man began at once to pay the penalty imposed upon him. To **Ḥawwah**,† **his wife**, was granted a brief respite; but finally **she conceived** ‡ **and**, in process of time, **bore**

* The first verse supplies the genealogical table in *vv.* 17 ff. with a needed starting-point. See also the name *Yahweh*, which, the correctness of the reading being taken for granted (compare the Greek Version), the author of *vv.* 25 f. as well as *vv.* 3–16a would hardly have put into the mouth of Ḥawwah. For further discrepancies compare *vv.* 2 and 2e, *v.* 12 and iii. 17, and *vv.* 14 and 17. See also Budde, *BU*, 183 ff.; Bacon, *GG*, 105; comp. Dillman *i. l.*

† If, as has been suggested, iii. 20 belongs after iv. 1, this name must have been inserted after the former verse had been removed to its present position.

‡ Rashi and others give to this and the preceding verb the sense of the Pluperfect, and 1 Sam. ix. 15 ff. and 2 Kgs. viii. 1 ff. make it

her first child, **Ḳayin**. Comp. v. 3. The words with which she is represented as greeting him illustrate a saying of Jesus. She forgot the anguish he had cost her for joy that a man had been born into the world (Jno. xvi. 21); saying exultingly, **I have gained * a man with Yahweh**. The final phrase is not entirely clear, but it probably means by the aid of the Deity.†

2. The birth of Ḳayin was followed by that of a brother, but probably not, as some (Reuss) infer, immediately; for, had the author meant to represent the boys as twins, he would have done so in a way not to be mistaken. The name given to the younger was **Hebhel**, but the present text gives no reason for so naming

necessary to admit the possibility of such an interpretation; but it is more natural to suppose the author to have intended to say that the man did not know his wife, or, at any rate, that their intercourse did not result in conception, until after their expulsion from the garden.

* The verb קנה (*ḳanah*) was doubtless used, not because the author derived *Ḳayin* from it, but because the name, whose meaning according to some authorities is *spear* (*Dic. Bib.*), according to others *smith* (*Enc. Bib.*), in sound suggested it. In other words, it is a case of alliteration, imperfectly reproduced in English by the rendering *gained*.

† On the force of את, see Mic. iii. 8. It is also used to designate a definite Accusative. Hence some exegetes have interpreted *Yahweh* as a second Accusative, thus making Ḥawwah say that she had gotten the Deity either as a son (Luther) or a husband (Umbreit). Both of these alternatives must be rejected; the former because it anticipates a much later doctrine, and the latter because it is the child's, and not the husband's, name that is to be explained. A more attractive suggestion is that, as the Targum of Onkelos and the Samaritan Version would indicate, the original reading was not את, but מאת, *from with* or *from*. Zeydner (*ZAW*, 1898, 120) prefers אות, *sign*, interpreted here and *v.* 15 as circumcision, while Gunkel would emend את יהוה to אתאוה, *I desired*. The Greek Version has *through* (διά) *God*. Comp. Haupt in *Addenda* to Ball's *Genesis*, 118.

him.* In process of time he became **a keeper of sheep**; better, perhaps, small cattle, since the word usually rendered *sheep* includes both sheep and goats. See Gen. xxvii. 9. The inference is that he was the first of his class; but see *v.* 20, where the credit of introducing the occupation of keeping cattle large and small is given to Yabhal, the oldest son of Lemekh. That Hebhel ate the flesh, as well as drank the milk and wore the wool, of his flock, may be taken for granted. See also *v.* 4. The final clause, which was probably originally attached immediately to *v.* 1, or some form of it,† states that Ḳayin, following the example of his father, became **a tiller of the ground**. For the continuation of the original account of him, see *v.* 16b.

3. The date of the inserted incident is indefinite. It occurred **after a time**, lit. *after days*, when Ḳayin, not necessarily for the first time, **brought from the produce of the ground**, the fruit of his toil, **an offering**, tribute in kind, **to Yahweh**; to whom he thus formally acknowledged himself indebted for the success of his husbandry. 4a. At the same time Hebhel also brought an offering. He is said to have taken for this purpose **from the firstlings of his flock**; not, however, the entire carcass (Keil), but, as is explained in a gloss, **their fat**,‡ the

* The meaning of the name is disputed. A favorite opinion has been, that it is identical with the appellative *hebhel*, *breath*, *vanity*, and that it was given in allusion to the brevity of the owner's life; others have connected it with the Assyrian *aplu*, *son* (Schrader, *KAT*, 44 ff.); but a more probable conjecture is that, like the Syriac *habbala*, it originally had the signification *shepherd*. See *Yabhal*, *v.* 20.

† The supposition is that, before the introduction of Hebhel, the text had the unemphatic form ויהי קין. See Ges. § 142, 1.

‡ On the relation of this phrase to the preceding, see Ges. § 154, n. 1, b. One reason for pronouncing it a gloss is that the suffix of

parts which, according to the Mosaic ritual (Ex. xxiii. 18b; Lev. iii. 3 f.), were regularly burned on the altar. The rest furnished the feast which always accompanied such an offering.

4b. **Yahweh had regard to Hebhel and his offering**; gave it his approval. How he did so, the author neglects to say. He probably would have said by sending fire to consume the offering, as in the case of Manoah's (Jud. vi. 21) or Elijah's (1 Kgs. xviii. 38). Comp. Strack. 5. On the other hand, **to Ḳayin and his offering he had not regard**. Here again there is left plenty of room for conjecture; but it is not probable that the author would have explained the failure of Ḳayin to please his Maker as due to the character of his offering; *e. g.*, because it was a vegetable rather than an animal offering (Tuch), or because it was not so choice as that of his brother (Delitzsch); much less because it was not properly prepared for the altar (Ball). He would be the last to attribute importance to such matters. The natural inference from *v.* 7 is that Ḳayin had manifested a bad disposition, and that the rejection of his offering was of the nature of an admonition. This inference seems to be confirmed by his conduct on the present occasion. He became **very angry and downcast**, lit. *his face fell.* See the English *chapfallen.*

6. Yahweh remonstrated with him, **Why art thou angry?**

7. Ḳayin was angry because he and his offering had not been received with favor. This fact makes it necessary to suppose that, in the apodosis of **If thou doest**

חלבהן (Sam. חלביהן) is plural, although under the circumstances the author of the story can hardly have thought of Hebhel as bringing more than one animal. On the construction of the phrase, *of the firstlings*, etc., so interpreted, see Ex. vi. 25 and Job xxvii. 6.

well, the word expressing the result, lit. *uplifting*,* is to be rendered, not *cheerfulness* (Dillmann), but **acceptance**. See 1 Sam. xxv. 35. This rendering is in harmony with the natural interpretation of the next clause, where **doth not sin lie at the door** † teaches that the evil-doer must answer for his deeds, and implies that no such person can expect to find favor for himself or his offerings with Yahweh. The teaching of the whole utterance, therefore, is, that "the sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination to Yahweh" (Prv. xv. 8; see also Am. v. 21 ff.; Isa. i. 10 ff.). There follows a statement that has the appearance of a gloss suggested by a mistaken interpretation of the word *lie*.‡ Its real force is seen in Deu. xxix. 19/20. The scribe, however, probably with Gen. xlix. 9 in mind, interpreted it as meaning *lie in wait*, and, thinking it important that the reader should be reminded that man had power to resist evil even after his expulsion from Paradise, added **yet toward thee shall be its**, the crouching sin's, **longing, and thou shalt rule**, prevail, **over it**. The inappropriateness of the term *longing* in this connection is apparent.§

* שאת.

† The last words are usually rendered affirmatively, *sin lieth*, etc., but the parallelism between the two conditional clauses requires that the interrogative, which, in the original, precedes the particle introducing the first, should be supplied with the second. See Ges. § 152, 3.

‡ רבץ.

§ The present text has been rendered, *Whether thou bringest a rich offering or not*, etc. (Budde); but, although נשא might mean *bring a gift*, היטיב לשאת could hardly mean *bring a rich gift*. The Greek Version reads, *If thou bringest rightly, but dost not rightly divide, hast thou not sinned? Be still; to thee shall be his* (Hebhel's) *return*, etc.; and in spite of the evident unnaturalness of the first, and the inconsequence of the last, half of the verse thus rendered, Ball corrects the text to make it agree with this reading.

(b) *The Offerer's Resentment* (*vv.* 8–16) finally — how soon does not appear — vented itself upon his innocent brother.

8. The present text is corrupt or defective. The verse begins, **Then Ḳayin said to Hebhel**; but no speech of the one to the other follows. The Samaritan reading, which is followed by the versions, puts into Ḳayin's mouth, **Let us go to the field**, and the insertion of these or similar words seems justified by the context.* If Ḳayin's crime immediately followed his rejection by Yahweh, the object of the invitation may have been to draw Hebhel away from the altar, where the violence intended would have been sacrilege (Strack). In any case they were apart from the rest of the family when Ḳayin **assailed**, lit. *arose against*,† **Hebhel his brother and killed him**.

9. As in the case of the first transgression, the deed is hardly committed before Yahweh appears on the scene. Ḳayin, however, meets the accusation implied in the question, **Where ‡ is Hebhel, thy brother?** not with an excuse, but with a falsehood. Indeed, he supplements the lie, **I know not**, with a gratuitous display of insolence worthy of a hardened criminal, **Am I my brother's keeper?**

The only change that seems required is the omission of the last letter of חַטָּאת, *sin*, thus transforming it from a feminine to a masculine, so that it will agree with its predicate רֹבֵץ, *lying*. See the Syriac Version, in which the subjects of the last clause are transposed.

* Tuch supplies *it* after וַיֹּאמֶר, while Böttcher emends by changing this verb to וַיִּשְׁמֹר, *and he watched*, and אֶל, *to*, to אֵת, the sign of the definite Accusative; but neither of these suggestions has found much favor. More attractive is Ball's (*Addenda*) suggestion, וַיֶּאֱרֹב, *and he lay in wait*.

† עַל, with Ball, instead of the אֶל, *to*, of the Massoretic text.

‡ For אַי read, with the Samaritans, אַיֵּה. So Ball.

10. Here, as in iii. 13, Yahweh's disapproval first takes the form of a question, **What hast thou done?** then he distinctly charges Ḳayin with the crime that he has committed, **The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me**, demanding retribution.

11. Ḳayin attempts no defence. Yahweh therefore at once proceeds with the sentence, **Cursed shalt thou be from the ground**. The meaning of the last phrase is disputed. The prominence given to the thought of banishment in the following context has led most exegetes to interpret the preposition *from* as denoting separation (Dillmann); but since, according to 12a, the ground is actually to be cursed with unfruitfulness on Ḳayin's account, the author must here have thought of it as the means by which he was to be punished, as well as the place from which in punishment he was to be banished. By **the ground that hath opened its mouth to receive thy brother's blood** is meant the comparatively fertile region in which the crime was committed. See *vv.* 14 and 16.

12. The twofold nature of the curse is now explained. Of **the ground** Yahweh says, **it shall no longer* yield thee its wealth**, lit. *strength* (Hos. vii. 9), as if it had thus far been normally fruitful. Comp. iii. 17 f. Secondly, and partly on account of the difficulty of obtaining a subsistence from the soil, but partly in obedience to the spur of conscience, he is to be **a wanderer and a fugitive** up and down **in the earth**.

13. The prospect that these words disclose to Ḳayin fills him with terror; but, instead of confessing the enormity of his guilt, as he has been understood by translators and commentators to have done, he merely protests against the severity of the penalty imposed upon

* On the Jussive תִּסַּף, lit. *let it no longer*, see Ges. § 109, 2, b.

him. **My punishment**, he says in response to the divine decree, **is greater than I can bear**.

14. His version of the sentence omits any mention of the diminution of the fruitfulness of the earth.* Nor does he seemingly object to banishment **from the face of the ground**, the cultivable and cultivated region in which he may be supposed to have been born and reared, although it implies absence from Yahweh as well as endless unrest, so much as the threatened exposure to the vengeance of his fellows. His plea is, **Whosoever**, the first one who, **meeteth me will kill me**. The most brutal men are often the most cowardly. The question, Whom did Ḳayin fear? is not so difficult as has sometimes been imagined. The answer is probably to be found in the admission that the Ḳayin here meant was not the son of the first man, but belonged to a later generation; in other words, that this story was not written for its present setting.

15. Yahweh admitted Ḳayin's plea and provided against the dreaded result. **If any one kill Ḳayin**, he decreed, **he** (Ḳayin) **shall be avenged sevenfold**. Comp. Dillmann. He also **appointed**, selected and ordained, **for Ḳayin**, in his interest and for his protection, **a sign**. This sign was not a wonder to allay Ḳayin's fears, lest he should himself be murdered (Clarke), but a warning to those whom he feared, that **whoever met him should not kill him**, *i. e.*, to prevent any one who met him from killing him. This, according to some early authorities, was a miraculous intervention of Yahweh to terrify his assailant (*Ber. Rab.* 105 f.). A more probable opinion is that it was a mark on the body, perhaps the forehead, by which he would be recognized as a man under divine

* A circumstance which may indicate that 12a is not a part of the original text.

protection. Marks of this sort are referred to Ex. xiii. 9; Lev. xix. 28; Eze. ix. 4 ff.; also Rev. xiii. 16 f.; etc. See Stade, *ZAW*, 1894, 301 ff.

16. Thus furnished, through the divine clemency, **Ḳayin went forth from the presence of Yahweh**, and the region under Yahweh's immediate protection, **and dwelt in the land of Nodh**. The expression *dwelt* is hardly in harmony with the sentence pronounced upon Ḳayin, to the effect that he should be a fugitive in the earth. Hence the statement of which it is a part probably belonged originally, not to the preceding story, but with *vv.* 17 ff. This leaves the meaning of the name *Nodh* unexplained, the author by whom it was preserved saying of the region thus designated only that it was **eastward of Eden**, on the eastern border of that in which, according to ii. 8, the garden was situated. Comp. Boscawen, *BM*, 92 f.

The story of the first murder interrupted that of

(2) The Earliest Civilization (*vv.* 17–24). The latter is now resumed. 17. Ḳayin, who, according to *v.* 2, became a tiller of the soil, finally took a **wife**. Where he got her, the author seems not to have thought it necessary to explain. It is probably to be taken for granted here and throughout this genealogy, that the record is either necessarily or intentionally incomplete. Ḳayin's wife **bore Ḥanokh**.* The author proceeds to say that

* The name occurs several times in the Old Testament; once as that of a son of Midian (Gen. xxv. 4). It is therefore hardly safe to say that its original signification was *Instruction* or *Dedication*. Cheyne (*EB*), art. *Cainites*, following Sayce (*HL*, 185), identifies it with *Unug* (*Abode*), the Akkadian form of *Uruk* (Heb. *'Orekh*), the name of a city associated with the Babylonian as well as the biblical Nimrodh, the date of whose origin belongs to the earliest period in the history of Mesopotamian civilization. See *Dic. Bib.* art. *Erech;* Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 221 ff.

he, Ḥanokh, **was the builder of a city**; *i. e.*, the first to engage in such an enterprise; and that he called it **after his** own * **name Ḥanokh.** The difficulty in understanding the statement that a son of Ḳayin was the founder of a city is relieved by recalling that the Hebrew *city* was not necessarily a large enclosure (xix. 20), and that originally there was no connection between this passage and the story of the fratricide.

18. The next four names in the genealogy are mere links connecting the head of the line with later and more important descendants. To Ḥanokh **was born 'Iradh**,† who begot **Meḥiyya'el**,‡ who in turn begot **Methusha'el**,§ the father of Lemekh.‖

* The Massoretic text has כשם בנו, *after his son's name*, requiring that Ḳayin be made the subject of both verbs. This, however, is awkward and unlike the author of the passage. It is therefore probable that the original text had הוא, *he* (*was*), instead of, or חנוך, *Ḥanokh*, after ויהי *and was*, and that, when this reading was wittingly or unwittingly changed, the word בן, *son*, was inserted to give the whole the desired or supposed import. See Budde, *BU*, 120 ff.; comp. Dillmann.

† The derivation of this name is in dispute. If related to עירוד, *wild ass*, it would naturally denote swiftness or shyness. Holzinger suggests a connection with ערד, *'Aradh*, a city of southern Judah (Jud. i. 16). If, however, Ḥanokh represents Uruk, it is certainly possible that, as Sayce (*HL*, 185 f.) also maintains, 'Iradh is only another form of Eridu, the name of another Babylonian city as ancient as it was famous. Comp. Cheyne, *EB*, art. *Cainites*.

‡ The name of the son of 'Iradh appears in two slightly different forms, מחויאל and מחייאל, in this connection. Of the two Budde (*BU*, 125 ff.) seems to have shown that the latter, the pronunciation

§ This name is capable of two interpretations. If שׁ, *sha*, be treated as a relative, as in Assyrian, it will mean *man of God:*

‖ The name Lemekh finds no explanation in the Hebrew vocabulary. Budde (*BU*, 102, 129) conjectures that it must have some

19. This Lemekh is important for his own sake, being the first polygamist. He had **two wives.** The fact is reported without apparent disapproval. Hence it is safer to suppose that, originally at any rate, it was intended to serve as an indication of material progress than of moral deterioration (Dillmann). The names of his wives were **'Adhah**, according to xxxvi. 2 that of one of the wives of Esau (comp. xxvi. 34), and **Ṣillah.***

of which he changes from *Mᵉḥiyya'el* to *Maḥyi'el, God giveth life*, is the preferable reading. If, however, the genealogy is really ancient, this form, being good Hebrew, must be either a translation or a corruption of the original name. The conjecture that the form here found is a mistake for the מהללאל, *Mᵉḥᵉlal'el* of v. 12 (Lagarde), and the latter a corruption of the Assyrian compound *Amil-ili, man of God* (Cheyne), can hardly be called satisfactory. See further Ball, *SBOT, Notes.*

---

otherwise it must be rendered *man of desire.* Cheyne and others, on the evidence of the Greek Version, pronounce it a corruption of מתושלח, *Methushelaḥ* (v. 21), in which they see the Hebraised form of the Assyrian compound *Mutu-sharraḥi, man of the gigantic one*, the equivalent of *Amil-Sin* (Berosus, *Amempsinos*), *man of Sin*, the name of one of the antediluvian kings of Babylonian mythology. See Cheyne, *EB*, art. *Cainites;* Lenormant, *BH*, 220. The most attractive feature of this last view is that Sin, the Moon, was the patron deity of 'Ur and Ḥaran. See Jastrow, *RBA*, 76.

---

connection with arms or violence. Sayce and others connect it with *Lamga*, a non-Semitic title of the god Sin, of which *Ubarra* in *Ubarra-Tutu, servant of Marduk*, the name of another king of the antediluvian period (Berosus, *Obartes*), is the equivalent. See Sayce, *HL*, 186; Lenormant, *BH*, 220; Ball, *SBOT, Notes.*

* The attempt has been made to discover in these names a mythical significance (Lenormant, *BH*, 188 ff.); but they are so easily explained as personifications of qualities valued in women, that this has now become the favorite opinion. As Hebrew appellatives they would be rendered respectively *Beauty* and *Shadow.* See Baethgen, *BSR*, 149 ff.; Cheyne, *EB*, art. *Cainites.*

20. 'Adhah bore her husband at least two sons. The name of the first mentioned was **Yabhal**.* **He was the father**, the first to engage in such an occupation, of **every† one that dwelleth in tents with cattle,‡** wandering from place to place with the flocks and herds in which his wealth consists. Yabhal, therefore, was not only the first shepherd, but the first nomad. Compare *vv.* 2 and 12. Moreover, the nomadic life here appears to be perfectly legitimate and honorable.

21. A brother of Yabhal, named **Yubhal**,§ became **the father of every one that handleth the lyre and the pipe.** The former was the simplest, commonest, and therefore doubtless the oldest, stringed instrument in use among the Hebrews. It was played by all classes and on all occasions. See xxxi. 27; 1 Sam. x. 5 (Eng. *harp*). It was the instrument that David played with his recognized skill (1 Sam. xvi. 16 ff.). See Benziger,

* The word occurs (Isa. xxx. 25) in the sense of *conduit, canal*, but here it seems to be an equivalent of *Hebhel, Shepherd.* The Greek Version has *Yobel*, the Hebrew of which means *ram, i. e.*, the *leader* of the flock.

† The word כל is wanting in the Massoretic text, but, being used in *v.* 21, should without doubt be supplied in this, a precisely similar connection.

‡ This is the proper rendering, whether the correct text be אהל ומקנה, lit. *tent and cattle*, or, as Ball (comp. *Addenda*), following 2 Chr. xiv. 14/15 and the Greek Version, prefers to read, אהלי מקנה, lit. *tents of cattle.* On the construction, see Ges. § 117, 4, R 4, c.

§ This word also occurs (Jer. xvii. 8) in the sense of *stream.* Dillmann suggests that its appropriateness as the name of a musician is explained by a connection with יובל, sometimes used in the sense of *ram's horn* (Ex. xix. 13). Since, however, the original meaning of the latter was *ram* (Jos. vi. 5) his explanation seems defective. A better is that it is an arbitrary variation on the preceding name to denote a different, but related, occupation. See Baethgen, *BSR*, 149; comp. Cheyne, *EB*, art. *Cainites.*

HA, 274 ff.; *Dic. Bib.* art. *Music.* The latter of the instruments named was probably a correspondingly simple wind instrument, perhaps the Pan's pipe. See Benziger, *HA*, 276; Riehm, *HBA*, art. *Musik.* Thus, according to the Hebrews, the first musician, though not himself a shepherd, was a brother to the first to adopt the pastoral calling.

22. Ṣillah also bore Lemekh a son, **Tubhal**; of whom the author seems to have intended to say, that **he was the father of every one that worketh copper and iron**,* in other words, the first metallurgist. This Tubhal had a sister, whose name, like that of the Ammonitess, Rehoboam's mother (1 Kgs. xiv. 21), was **Na'amah**.† She seems to have no function except to make the number of children assigned to Ṣillah equal to that of her rival's family. For the legends with which the Hebrews

* The Massoretic text has *Tubhal Ḳayin a smith every one*, etc., which is clearly not the original reading. The analogy of the statements respecting Yabhal and Yubhal requires דהוא היה אבי, *he was the father of*, in this case also. The Greek Version, which has καὶ ἦν instead of κάιν, points in the same direction. The word לטש, *smith*, is probably a marginal gloss to חרש, whose present position is explained by the fact that it is also a synonym of חין, or, at any rate, of the Aramaic קיני. The objection by Budde (*BU*, 139), that לטש is too rare a word for a gloss, loses its force when one recalls that, although it is less frequent than חרש in the same sense in Hebrew, the latter is not used in this sense in Aramaic, the language of the later Hebrews, while the former is common to the two dialects. As for the name *Tubhal*, it also seems to be a variation upon *Yabhal*, but, if it is, its precise form may have been determined by that of the name of a tribe, the Tibarenians, southeast of the Black Sea (x. 2), who supplied Tyre with implements in copper or bronze (Eze. xxvii. 13).

† In Jos. xv. 41, this name, which means *pleasant*, is given to a place in southern Judah. See also *No'omi* and *Na'aman*. This is evidently another case of the same sort as those of 'Adhah and Ṣillah. See Baethgen, *BSR*, 150.

supplemented their lack of knowledge respecting her, see Lenormant, *BH*, 204 ff.

23. There follows a song put into the mouth of Lemekh. The close connection between it and the account of the origin of metallurgy naturally gave rise to the supposition that it was intended to commemorate the discovery by Tubhal of the art of manufacturing weapons from the metal in which he wrought (Herder). If, however, it were a sword-song, Lemekh should have been the inventor of the sword as well as the author of the song.* When interpreted, as it must be, by itself, it will be found to voice the fierce passions and the crude notions of justice that the *lex talionis* (Ex. xxi. 12 ff.; Deu. xix. 1 ff.; Num. xxxv. 9 ff.) was intended to regulate. In form it consists of three distichs, each of which illustrates the most striking feature of Hebrew poetry, parallelism. In the first, the object of which is to secure the attention of those addressed, **'Adhah and Ṣillah** is repeated in **wives of Lemekh**†, and **hear** ‡ **my voice** in **give ear to my speech**. The members of a so-called synonymous parallelism, however, are not always perfectly equivalent. Hence it is not necessary to suppose that the victim of Lemekh's vengeance is the same person in both cases. His boast is that he slays **a man**, either the one who has injured him or a relative, if he is **wounded**, and **a boy** belonging to the family of the offender for **a**

* Budde (*BU*, 139 ff.) contends that this was the original sense of the passage, and emends the text to make it correspond to his theory; omitting 22b, and, for קין לטש כל, *Ḳayin a smith all*, substituting ויהי למך, *and Lemekh was*, or, if 22b must be retained, inserting ויהי למך וג׳ after it.

† Compare Holzinger, who attaches the former phrase to the superscription, so that the song is made to begin, *Hear my voice*, etc.

‡ On the form שמען see Ges. § 46, 2, R 3.

wale, a less serious injury. In both* cases the harm he inflicts far exceeds that which he himself has suffered.

24. The ratio, death for a blow, Lemekh finally puts into a numerical form. **If**, he says, **Ḳayin**, the first of the race to bear a personal name, **was avenged**, or avenged himself,† **sevenfold, then shall Lemekh be seventy and seven times**, as fully as possible.‡ See Mat. xviii. 22.

The above is the natural interpretation of *vv.* 17–24 apart from their context. When, however, they are viewed as a part of the larger whole to which they belong, they cease to be merely a picture of the social and industrial activities of the earliest ages, and, so repulsive is Lemekh's frank brutality, according to the author to whom they owe their present position, mark a stage in the progress of the race in violence and wickedness. The modern reader, who realizes the twofold significance of the passage, will find in its history an illustration of the rapidity with which the Hebrews under the tuition of the prophets developed in the direction of morality. For other cases of the same kind, see vi. 1 ff. and ix. 20 ff.

Having thus followed the line of Ḳayin until it be-

* On the rendering given to the verb, see Ges. § 107, 2, c. On the meaning of ילד, sometimes improperly translated *young man*, see 2 Kgs. ii. 23 f.

† The reflexive idea would properly be expressed by וְקֻם rather than יֻקַּם. Hence Budde (*BU*, 134) emends the text by substituting the former for the latter.

‡ The reference to Ḳayin at first sight seems to argue that the chapter thus far is a unit; but the Ḳayin of this song, though no match for Lemekh in the latter's estimation, is a heroic figure, and therefore the conception of another than the author of the story of the fratricide.

came alienated from God, the sacred historian returns to his starting-point with the first pair, and thence traces

b. The Line of Sheth (iv. 25–v. 32).

He seems to have had at his hand two complete accounts of Sheth and his descendants. One of these, for obvious reasons, he preserved entire. The one best suited to his purpose, however, entirely ignored both Ḳayin and Hebhel. To forestall the natural effect of this omission, he inserted

(1) A Genealogical Fragment (iv. 25 f.), which is supposed to be the beginning of the (to him) less valuable genealogy.* For other remnants of it, see chapter v.

25. After the murder of Hebhel **the man† knew his wife,‡ again**. Her third son **she § called Sheth,**

* This second genealogy, which had the same number of names as the first, in its original form is attributed to J^2; the modifications that appear in the fragment here preserved, to the editor by whom the story of the fratricide was inserted (Cornill, *EAT*, 43 f.; Oxford *Hex.* ii. 7). On the source of the original there are two principal theories. The more prevalent is that it was constructed from the Ḳayinite genealogy by the insertion of the names of Sheth and 'Enosh (Budde, *BU*, 175 ff.). Stade (*ZAW*, 1894, 276 ff.), however, contends that these two names originally belonged to the Ḳayinite genealogy, and that therefore the latter, in the form in which it has been preserved, was produced by their removal. See also Steuernagel, *DJ*, 269; comp. Lenormant, *BH*, 184 ff.

† This is the reading that seems to be required by the analogy of ii. 15 and iii. 22 and 24, passages closely related to this verse. The Massoretic text has *'Adham*. See Budde, *BU*, 135, 162 f.

‡ Her name appears in the Greek and the Syriac Version; also the clause, *and she conceived*. The Greek Version further inserts *saying* before Ḥawwah's speech; but this is perhaps only a free rendering for the כי, *for*, of the original, which is not otherwise translated. For עוד, *again*, on the other hand, it presents no equivalent.

§ For ותקרא, *and she called*, the Samaritans read ויקרא, *and he called*.

explaining the name by saying, **God**, not Yahweh (see *v.* 26), **hath set** * **me other offspring instead of Hebhel**. These words make the clause, **since Ḳayin hath killed him**, by the same or a later hand, an unnecessary amplification. Comp. Delitzsch.

26. The complete genealogy might have been introduced without further preliminaries. A second section from the parallel account, however, is added, probably for the purpose of preserving the interesting statement with which it closes, to the effect that **'Enosh**,† the son of Sheth, **was the first** ‡ **to call on the name of Yahweh**. Elsewhere (xii. 8; xiii. 4; xxi. 33; xxvi. 25; Ex. xxxiv. 5) to *call by the name of Yahweh* means to worship him. This, however, can hardly be its meaning in the present passage. Its actual significance may be inferred from the fact that, in the preceding verse, pains is taken to avoid the use of the name *Yahweh*. In other words, it means that, according to the author here represented, this divine name was first used in the time of 'Enosh. Comp. Dillmann. For other views on the subject, see Ex. iii. 14 f. and vi. 2 f.§

* Hebrew שֵׁת, *shath*, a word-play like that in *v.* 1. See also v. 29. The real significance of the name is unknown.

† Like *'Adham* originally an appellative for *man*, but mostly poetical. See Ps. viii. 5.

‡ The Massoretic text has אָז הוּחַל, *then was begun*, but the analogy of x. 8 requires הוּא הֵחֵל, *he began*. See also the Greek and Samaritan readings, which, though themselves faulty, indicate what must have been the original phraseology.

§ The only passage that can be cited against the interpretation here given is *v.* 1, where the name *Yahweh* is put into the mouth of Ḥawwah; but, if it is from J^1, *Yahweh* is perfectly in place in it, and if it is from the same author as these last verses, the reading should undoubtedly be *God*, as in the Greek Version. Steuernagel's theory (*DJ*, 269), that *vv.* 25 f. originally preceded *v.* 1, furnishes a third alternative.

(2) The Complete Genealogy (v.), for which the fragment just discussed was intended to prepare the way, was doubtless preferred because, although it was not so interesting to the casual reader, it furnished the materials for a chronology of the earliest period of the world's history.

1. In the document from which it was taken it constituted a separate book with a title of its own, **This is the Book of the Generations of 'Adham**. This title betrays the author of the table, and the statement that, **when God created men**, he made them **in the likeness of God**, confirms the first impression, *viz.*, that the passage came from the same source as the first account of creation, the so-called Priestly narrative. See ii. 4; i. 26 f.

2. For the phrase **male and female**, see i. 27. The statement that God **blessed them** refers to i. 28 f., and that concerning the name given to them, **Man**, to i. 26.

3. The common term, in Hebrew *'Adham*, which originally included both man and woman, is now first applied as a proper name to the first man. When he had lived **a hundred and thirty years, he begot a child.*** It is plain enough from these words that the author of the genealogy intended to represent this child as 'Adham's firstborn. His meaning is rendered unmistakable by the addition of **in his own likeness and after his own image**, an explanation which would naturally accompany a description of the first birth, but which would be superfluous in any subsequent case. This, however, is not the entire significance of the expression. The image of 'Adham can only mean likeness to the God-like nature with which he was endowed at his creation (i. 27). The author therefore ignores, not only Ḳayin and Hebhel,

* On the omission of the object, which Ball supplies, see Ges. § 117, 1, R 5.

but the story of the Fall and its consequences. In other words, as has already been intimated, this fifth chapter is the continuation of ii. 3.

4. The interval between the creation of 'Adham and the birth of his first child is a long one, but it is not out of proportion to the rest of his life, for he **lived** * after begetting his firstboru no fewer than **eight hundred years**.

5. The notice of 'Adham closes with the total of the years of his life. It makes so vast a period that many ardent defenders of the Scriptures have felt forced to interpret the terms used as having other than their natural and obvious meanings. Thus, *e. g.*, it has been proposed to reckon the year here and elsewhere in this chapter as a period of less than twelve months.† This method, however, creates as serious difficulties as it removes: for (*1*), unless unwarrantable violence is done to the text, some of the patriarchs are thus made to beget children before they reach the age for paternity; and (*2*) the period from 'Adham to Noaḥ, too short when the figures are given their largest value, is thus abbreviated to such an extent as to be absolutely insignificant. Finally, any such method of interpretation is forbidden by the fact

* The Massoretic text has ויהיו ימי אדם, *And the days of 'Adham were;* but the analogy of *vv.* 7, 10, etc., requires ויחי אדם, *And 'Adham lived*, and this is the reading of the Arabic, and some copies of the Syriac, Version.

† The following schemes are cited merely as curiosities: Hensler (*BPG*, 280 ff.) claims that a year means three months from Adam to Abraham, eight from Isaac to Joseph, and not until after the time of Joseph twelve. Rask's scheme (*ZHT*, 1836, 19 ff.) is still more complicated, giving to the year the value of one month from Adam to Noah, two from Shem to Serug, four from Nahor to Terah, six from Abraham to Amram, and twelve in and after the time of Moses.

that, in his account of the Flood, the author of the genealogy clearly teaches that the year of this early period consisted of twelve months. See especially viii. 5 ff. There is equally little to be said for the theory that the list of names is incomplete, and that therefore the numbers given do not measure the lives of individuals but of groups of persons (Delitzsch); or that the names represent tribes or dynasties of the antediluvian period (Crawford). The construction of the table is such as to show that it still has as many names as it ever contained,* and that each of these names was intended to designate an individual.† It must therefore be admitted that the author intended to say, and does say, that there were ten generations, neither more nor fewer, from 'Adham to Noaḥ, and that each of the persons representing them actually lived the given number of years. The first lived **nine hundred and thirty years**. His longevity, surprising in itself, becomes additionally troublesome if one attempt to harmonize it with the sentence pronounced upon him on his expulsion from Paradise (iii. 19). The fact that, as has already been noted, this author ignores the Fall relieves the latter difficulty, at the same time exposing the incorrectness of interpreting **then he died** here and elsewhere in this chapter as "a standing demonstration of the effect of disobedience" (Murphy). It is not death, but an untimely death, that is here regarded as penal.

6. The age at which Sheth begot his firstborn was

* Note the closeness of the articulation; also its conformity to the table in chapter xi., where, 'Abhram included, there are also just ten names.

† The theory that the names represent tribes, etc., betrays its inadequacy as soon as one asks what is meant by the division into two components of the number of years assigned to each of them, and what by the sons and daughters who in each case follow the firstborn.

a hundred and five years, or twenty-five years earlier than his father begot him. Nor does this fact stand alone. In the next three cases the age at which the first son is begotten becomes earlier and earlier, and originally the first nine cases formed a nearly unbroken diminishing series.* See below.

8. The same is true of the totals, although in the present text the series is three times interrupted by an increase. See below. Thus, **all the days of Sheth were** only **nine hundred and twelve years**.

9. The name **Ḳenan** recalls Ḳayin, but the similarity between them would hardly have attracted attention if there were no other or clearer parallels between this genealogy and that of the fourth chapter. The fact is that all the names of the latter reappear here, two besides 'Adham in the same, the rest in more or less modified forms. The following table shows to what extent they agree or differ either in form or order:

Chapter IV.	Chapter V.
Ḳayin	Ḳenan
Ḥanokh	Mahalal'el
'Iradh	Yeredh
Meḥiyya'el	Ḥanokh
Methusha'el	Methushelaḥ
Lemekh	Lemekh

The similarity between the two lists is best explained by supposing that one of them is based on the other. The prevalent opinion, therefore, is that the names of the second, since they belong to a comparatively late work, so far as they differ in form or order, are more or less arbitrary variations upon those of the first.* Comp.

* The changes may have been made by the author of this chapter (P), or he may have found them already made in the genealogy, antedating his own, of which iv. 25 f. (J^2) was the beginning.

Delitzsch; also Lenormant, *HB*, 185 f. This being the case, it is more probable that Ḳenan contains a subtle reference to iv. 17 than that it connects the son of 'Enosh with a Sabean divinity (Holzinger).*

12. In the Ḳayinite genealogy the next name in order was that of Ḥanokh (iv. 17). In this it is **Mahalal'el**. Thus, on the supposition that it is a variation upon Meḥiyya'el, the son takes the place of the father of 'Iradh (Yeredh). By this change the fifth name (Praise-of-God) is made to suggest that the first half of the antediluvian period was characterized by godliness, while that of Ḥanokh, as will appear, in the seventh place furnishes the exception to a contrary rule for the last half of the period.†

15. The firstborn of Mahalal'el was **Yeredh**, whose name, lit. *Descent*,‡ indicates that he, the first in the second half of the list, marked a turning-point, the beginning of decadence in the history of mankind.

18. In the present text the evidence of the name is unsupported. When, however, as it still does in the Samaritan reading, the record said that Yeredh begot his eldest son at the age of sixty-two, instead of **a hundred and sixty-two years**, and a computation based on these and corresponding figures showed that he, as well as Methushelaḥ and Lemekh, perished in the Flood, there could be no doubt that the author of the table meant to represent him as a sinner. Comp. Dillmann.

19. The remnant of Yeredh's years, according to the present text, was **eight hundred**, for which the Samaritans read seven hundred and eighty-five.

* The idea is that the author may have had קִנָּן (*ḳanan*), whence קֵן (*ḳen*), *nest*, in mind. Comp. Böttcher, § 474, γ.

† For a detailed discussion of the significance of the names and numbers of this table, see Budde, *BU*, 93 ff.

‡ From יָרַד, *go down*.

20. The result of the adoption of the Samaritan reading is the reduction of the length of Yeredh's life from **nine hundred and sixty-two** to eight hundred and forty-seven years. In other words, instead of being longer, it becomes considerably shorter, than that of any of his progenitors, being cut short, as above intimated, by the Flood. These figures embody the author's idea of the consequences of the decadence of which Yeredh is the first representative.

21. Ḥanokh begot his eldest at the normal age of **sixty-five.**

22. His subsequent life was brief, but, lest the reader should infer from this fact that he was particularly wicked, it is distinctly stated in this connection that he **walked with God,*** lived in constant harmony with the divine will (vi. 9), those **three hundred**, and probably the preceding years.

23. The number **three hundred and sixty-five**, representing the length of Ḥanokh's life, has its significance, but in this connection it can hardly have been interpreted as betraying a connection between the patriarch and a solar divinity (Lenormant, *BH*, 253 ff.). It is probable that the author, both by giving him the seventh place (Jude 14) and assigning him the same number of years as there are days in the year, desired to indicate that, brief as was his life, it was still in a sense complete. See viii. 14, according to which the Flood lasted three hundred and sixty-five days.†

24. Ḥanokh was the first to finish his earthly life, but

* The unnaturalness as well as the ambiguity of this expression seems to warrant the belief that in this first instance it has been substituted for the regular formula *lived.* See Budde, *BU*, 170 ff.

† For ויהי, the singular, at the beginning of the verse read with the Samaritans ויהיו, the plural. See also *v.* 31.

he did not die. While he walked with God **he was not**, having suddenly disappeared from the midst of his fellows. His disappearance is explained by the brief statement that **God had taken him**; the idea being that, as a reward for his uncommon piety, the patriarch was graciously delivered from the corruption of his time and translated, as Elijah was afterward (2 Kgs. ii. 11), to the immediate society of the Deity. See i. 26; comp. Delitzsch. The location of the divine abode is not given, but, wherever it was, it is evident that the author thought of it, not as a good that all men had hopelessly lost, but as one that some at least might by their virtues gain. Comp. iii. 24. For the details with which the Jewish imagination has enriched this scanty record, see the Book of Enoch.*

25. The age of **Methushelaḥ** when his first son was begotten, according to the received text, exceeded, not only the normal limit, but even that at which his grandfather first obtained issue. He had lived to be **a hundred and eighty-seven** years old. Here, again, the size of the figures creates suspicion with reference to their genuineness, and in this case, as in that of Yeredh, it is necessary to substitute for them the Samaritan, sixty-seven.

26. In this case, as in that of Yeredh, the second component must be diminished as well as the first; for, although the received text says that the patriarch lived after begetting his firstborn **seven hundred and eighty-two** years, the Samaritan reading is six hundred and fifty-three.

* The story of Ḥanokh has a parallel in Babylonian mythology. In the epic of Uruk, however, the person who, with his wife, is made "like the gods" and translated "far away to the mouth of the streams," is Ut-napishtim, the hero of the Deluge. See *KB*, vi. 1, 244 ff.; Jastrow, *RBA*, 505 f.

27. Thus the total of his years was not **nine hundred and sixty-nine**, but seven hundred and twenty. The latter number harmonizes better than the former with the death of the patriarch by the Flood.*

28. The prepaternal component of Yeredh's life was found to be longer than it should be by a hundred years, that of Methushelaḥ by a hundred and twenty years. That of Lemekh in the received text is **a hundred and eighty-two** years, or a hundred and twenty-nine more than it is in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The antediluvian period as a whole is thus increased from a thousand three hundred and seven to a thousand six hundred and fifty-six years. Why it should have been lengthened at all, and why by just three hundred and forty-nine years, there is no means of knowing, but the most plausible explanation is that (*1*) the lives of Yeredh, Methushelaḥ, and Lemekh were lengthened, after the incorporation of the Shethite with the Ḳayinite genealogy, for the purpose of making the latter teach, not, as originally, the gradual deterioration of the race, but the godliness of the Shethites as compared with the Ḳayinites; † and (*2*) that the amount of the increment was determined by the next important date, that of the death of Noaḥ, who, according to ix. 28, lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty, or perhaps, according to the reviser, three hundred and forty-nine years.‡ In distributing the added

* If the original thought was to represent Methushelaḥ as having perished by violence at the comparatively early age of seven hundred and twenty, it is probable that his name, lit. *Man-of-the-javelin*, was intended to suggest the violence for which the latter part of the antediluvian period is said to have been distinguished (vi. 11).

† See Budde, *BU*, 103 ff.

‡ Another suggestion is, that the number added was chosen because it made the sum of the years from creation to the Exodus two thousand six hundred and sixty-six, or two thirds of four thou-

years the author of the new doctrine naturally gave fewest to the first, and most to the last of the patriarchs affected by the change.

29. The name of Lemekh's son was not mentioned in the preceding verse. This variation in phraseology recalls iv. 25, and prepares the reader for the parenthetical explanation similar to the one in that passage, and probably by the same author, that follows. The father called his child **Noaḥ, saying He will ease * us.** This is a prophetic utterance. It must, therefore, refer to some feature of Noaḥ's character or some event in his subsequent history. Now in the story of the Flood there occurs a passage (viii. 21) in which Yahweh is represented as so pleased with the sacrifice offered by Noaḥ, when delivered, that he resolves not again to curse the ground on men's account. The words recall iii. 17, and, although this is not the view usually taken, they may be interpreted as having reference to a curse like that pronounced upon the ground as a part of the penalty for 'Adham's disobedience. It is probable that the author of this passage so understood them, and took the two words, properly rendered *not again*, in the possible sense

sand, the number representing the expected duration of the world. See Nöldeke, *UKAT*, 111 ff.; *Enc. Bib.* Art. *Chronology*, 4; comp. Budde, *BU*, 106.

* The verb is נחם IV, the first two consonants of which are the same as those of *Noaḥ*. Ball substitutes for it נח because (*1*) it more closely resembles the name in question, and (*2*) it is the word that seems to be required by the ἀναπαύω of the Greek Version. But (*1*) it is plain from iv. 1 that in such cases strict correspondence between the terms is not to be expected; and (*2*) it will appear on examination that the verb suggested by Ball does not convey the thought that the author evidently wished to express. The actual derivation and significance of the name are unknown. For various theories with reference to it, see Dillmann.

of *no longer*, thus getting the idea that Noaḥ by his piety procured the removal of the curse. He therefore makes Lemekh look for relief through his first-born from the **work** and the **toil** occasioned by the stubbornness of **the ground, which Yahweh** * **hath cursed.** Compare Holzinger, who finds in the words of Lemekh a prediction of the discovery of wine by Noaḥ (ix. 20 ff.).

30. The remnant of Lemekh's years, according to the Samaritans, was six hundred, but the received text says **five hundred and ninety-five**.

31. The reason for the deduction is apparent. The six hundredth year was that of the Flood, in which, therefore, according to the original reading, after a comparatively short life of six hundred and fifty-three years, he perished. If the number six hundred had been retained, he would still have died in the year of the Flood, at the age of only **seven hundred and eighty-two**, and the inference would have been the same as in the former case, that he was a sinner. The subtraction of five years made his total **seven hundred and seventy-seven**, a number, suggested perhaps by iv. 24, which, like three hundred and sixty-five, though not large, would be considered symbolic of completion. See also Mat. xviii. 22.

32. The genealogy ends with a notice of the birth of the three sons of Noaḥ, not, of course, all at once, after he had reached the age of **five hundred years.** The explanation of the length of this interval is not far to seek. In the first place it was necessary to allow the godly patriarchs time to finish their lives. When Noaḥ was born, Mahalal'el, whose total falls a little short of nine hundred, had five hundred and eighty-three years to live. Hence the postponement of the Flood until Noaḥ's six hundredth year. If, however, his family had multiplied

* The Greek Version adds *God*.

at the rate at which the race was increasing when he was born, to save him, and for his sake all his house, it would have been necessary to make provision for no fewer than ten generations. On the other hand, if the increase of his family had been entirely suspended, there would have been no adequate provision for repeopling the earth after the Flood. Both difficulties were avoided by fixing the dates when he begot his sons after his five hundredth year. The names of these sons were **Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth.***

* Thus far only two rescensions of this genealogy have been mentioned, the Hebrew and the Samaritan; the latter, according to which it was a thousand three hundred and seven years from Creation to the Deluge, being preferred to the former. There is another, that of the Greek Version, which deserves notice. It differs from that of the received text chiefly in that its numbers representing the dates at which the patriarchs begot their first sons, if not already raised, are increased by a hundred, the same being deducted from the numbers representing the length of their subsequent lives. In the cases of Lemekh and Methushelaḥ both numbers seem to have been further manipulated, the one increased, the other diminished. The following table exhibits the three systems, the Samaritan being taken as the norm and the numbers in which the others differ from it being printed in heavy type, that the number and extent of the variations may be readily seen and appreciated.

	Firstborn			Remainder			Total			Death-date		
	S	H	G	S	H	G	S	H	G	S	H	G
'Adham	130	130	**230**	800	800	**700**	930	930	930	930	930	930
Sheth	105	105	**205**	807	807	**707**	912	912	912	1042	1042	**1142**
'Enosh	90	90	**190**	815	815	**715**	905	905	905	1140	1140	**1340**
Ḳenan	70	70	**170**	840	840	**740**	910	910	910	1235	1235	**1535**
Mahalal'el	65	65	**165**	830	830	**730**	895	895	895	1290	1290	**1690**
Yeredh	62	**162**	**162**	785	**800**	**800**	847	**962**	**962**	1307	**1422**	**1922**
Ḥanokh	65	65	**165**	300	300	**200**	365	365	365	887	**987**	**1487**
Methushelaḥ	67	**187**	**167**	653	**782**	**802**	720	**969**	**969**	1307	**1656**	**2256**
Lemekh	53	**182**	**188**	600	**595**	**565**	653	**777**	**753**	1307	**1651**	**2207**
Noaḥ	500	500	500	450	450	450	950	950	950	1657	**2006**	**2592**

This second revision is plausibly explained by a desire on the

There are those who still find reasons for believing that the names of this genealogy represent real persons, and that each of these persons actually lived the number of years he is reported to have lived. See Murphy ; Dawson, *EL W*, 84. These theses, however, cannot be maintained, the following considerations being conclusive to the contrary : (*1*) It is the general opinion of physiologists, that the human body is not adapted to bear the strain of more than, at most, two hundred years. See Thoms, *HL*. 14 ff. (*2*) There is reliable evidence that, at the close of the period covered by this genealogy, and in the region where the patriarchs are supposed to have flourished, the average length of human life was not much, if any, greater than in modern times,* and there is no equally good reason for believing that there were any exceptions so remarkable as these cases would have been, if they had existed. (*3*) It is incredible that the age of pa-

part of the Alexandrian Jews, not only to restore the symmetry of the table, but to bring the chronology based on it more nearly into harmony with an increased estimate of the antiquity of man. See Budde, *BU*, 112. At any rate, the result is the extension of the antediluvian period from a thousand six hundred and fifty-six to two thousand two hundred and forty-two years. The discovery that, as appears from the table, by this scheme Methushelaḥ lived fourteen years beyond the Flood led to its correction in the Hebrew text.

* This may be inferred from the length of the reigns of a succession of kings as recorded on a Babylonian tablet discovered in 1880. There are eleven of them, the first of whom must have reigned, at the latest, before the death of Noaḥ (1998 B. C., according to the received chronology), and perhaps before the biblical date of the Flood (2348 B. C.). The sum of their reigns was only three hundred and five years, the average being less than twenty-eight. See Hommel, *AHT*, 118 ff. The last eleven kings that ruled France before the Revolution reigned together two hundred and ninety-five, or an average of nearly twenty-seven years.

ternity in the direct line should never have fallen below sixty-two (Heb. sixty-five), and that in the case of Noah the first son should not have been born until the father was five hundred years old. (*4*) Finally, granting that the figures of the Greek Version are correct, their sum, two thousand two hundred and forty-two, falls far short of expressing the duration of the first period in the history of mankind. See Le Conte, *EG*, 618 ff.

These considerations show that, from the strictly historical standpoint, the chapter is of little value. In reality it is a more or less artificial scheme, probably suggested by the list of mythological kings who reigned before the Babylonian Deluge,* by which, in the absence of actual data, the author undertook to connect his doctrine concerning the origin of the world with the more historical parts of his narrative. It is not, however, a mere genealogy, but, as has also been shown, suggests, and was designed to suggest, ideas that made it of value to those for whom it was written. Indeed, in its original form it contained instruction on all the principal religious questions covered by the two preceding chapters. It taught the unity of the race. Its doctrine respecting the origin of sin differed, it is true, from that of the third chapter, but it laid just as great emphasis on the danger of defy-

* There were ten of them also. These are their names, with the number of years each reigned, according to Berosus:

Aloros.....36,000	Daonos.....36,000
Alaparos.....10,800	Euedoreschos.....64,800
Amelon.....46,800	Amempsinos.....36,000
Ammenon.....43,200	Otiartes.....28,800
Megalaros.....64,800	Xisuthros.....64,800

The total of their reigns, therefore, and the duration of the antediluvian period, was 432,000 years. See Cory, *AF*, 51 ff. On the ratio between this number and that representing the same period according to the Massoretic text, see *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Chronology*, 4.

ing or neglecting the will of the Creator. Did not three of its patriarchs perish by the Deluge? At the same time it taught, by its treatment of Ḥanokh and Noaḥ, the possibility of resisting evil and securing the constant favor and protection of the Almighty. These doctrines have been somewhat obscured in the course of the history of the chapter; but it still retains a religious significance, and for this reason deserves the place it occupies in the Hebrew Scriptures.

The fifth chapter brought the story of the development of mankind down to the birth of Shem and his brothers about a hundred years before the Flood. The continuation of that account is found in vi. 9 ff. These two passages from the Priestly narrative are separated by a fragment from another source, like the story of Ḳayin and Hebhel and the song of Lemekh calculated to prepare the mind of the reader for the terrible visitation by which the race was finally all but annihilated. It treats of

c. The Apostate Sons of God (vi. 1–8).

1. The date of the episode here narrated is not definitely fixed by the original author. Comp. *v.* 4. It happened **when men**, the race and not any part of it, as, *e. g.*, the descendants of Ḳayin as distinguished from those of Sheth,* **had begun to multiply**, be numerous, **on the face of the ground**. Comp. Murphy. At this time **daughters**, as well as sons, **had been born to them.** Hitherto the author of this story seems not to have mentioned the birth of a woman.† Comp. v. 4, *etc.*

* If, as may be the case, since this passage seems to be from the same hand as iv. 17 ff., the descendants of Ḳayin were originally intended, the author thought of them as constituting the entire human family.

† This favors the view that the last clause of iv. 22, in which

2. These women, so the author says, attracted the attention of **the sons of God**. The persons here meant are undoubtedly angels; but the idea that so exalted beings should have paired with human females, especially in view of Jesus' declaration as reported in Mat. xxii. 30, has offended many interpreters, and they have preferred other interpretations. Thus, some have held that the sons of God were sons of the mighty of the time (Rashi); others that they were the righteous, or the Shethites (Murphy): but the evidence is all in favor of the opinion first mentioned. (*1*) The phrase "sons of God" in the Old Testament invariably means the attendants of the heavenly court, to whom i. 26 and iii. 22 are supposed to refer. See Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7; Ps. xxix. 1; lxxxix. 6. (*2*) The belief in the possibility, and the occurrence, of intermarriages between divine and human beings was once almost universal. The classical instances are familiar. For a Shemitic parallel, see Ishtar's proposal to Gilgamesh (Schrader, *KB*, vi. i. 166 ff.; Jastrow, *RBA*, 481 ff.). (*3*) The New Testament expressly identifies the sons of God with angels. See 2 Pet. ii. 4 ff.; Jude 6. (*4*) This interpretation is further supported by such ancient authorities as the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Philo, Josephus, and most of the early Christian Fathers.* Compare, however, the Book of Adam and Eve, iii. 4. It was angels, then, who **saw that the daughters of men were fair**, and, being smitten by the external qualities that appeal to the senses, **took to themselves as wives whomsoever they chose**, without leave asked or

Na'amah is mentioned, is an addition to the original text. See Budde, *BU*, 141 ff.

* According to Tertullian there is a reference to this passage in 1 Cor. xi. 10.

granted. The author does not see fit to explain what form they wore in their conjugal relations. See, however, xviii. 8, etc.

3. At this point the natural order, which would require a statement concerning the issue of the marriages thus contracted, is interrupted by the introduction of a decree of Yahweh. The **spirit** of Yahweh in this connection is probably synonymous with the *breath* of the Almighty, the source of all animate existence (Job xxxiii. 4); but it may, as Wellhausen (*CH*, 305 f.) suggests, have special reference to the new infusion of the divine which the race had received through the angels. Whatever it is, it is not to **abide** * **in men**, lit. *man*, **forever**. The addition of the last word furnishes a clue to the meaning of the term *men*. It can hardly denote individuals; for Yahweh has already settled it that the life of the individual shall not endure indefinitely. See iii. 19, 22 ff.† It must, therefore, be the race as a whole that is threatened with a termination of its existence. The reason given, **since they also are flesh**,‡ is obscure. It prob-

* This is the uniform rendering of the Versions; but whether it can be gotten out of the Massoretic text is doubtful. Hence it has been suggested that for ידון (here only) there be substituted ידוד (Ilgen), ילון (Kuenen), or יכון (Ball). Others, retaining the present reading, render the verb *strive* (E. V.), *rule* (Delitzsch), or *be abased* (Dillmann). See also Berry, *JSL*, xvi. 47 ff.

† If, as Budde (*BU*, 44) claims, this verse originally immediately preceded iii. 23, the term *men* must then have denoted individuals; but since a decree again limiting the life of the individual would have been as superfluous there as here, there is little probability that the passage ever formed a part of the third chapter.

‡ This on the supposition that the correct reading is בשגם, lit. *in that also* (Ginsburg). The more common reading is בשגם, which is rendered *in their* (the angels') *error* (Dillmann). Ball (*Addenda*) explains it as originating in dittography of the follow-

ably means that men are of a lower order than the sons of God, and that therefore an intermixture of the two is unnatural and intolerable. The last clause fixes a definite limit beyond which it will not be permitted: **their days shall be a hundred and twenty years**. If the interpretation just given to the first half of the verse is correct, such a declaration can only mean that the figures here used measure the further existence of the race. This view is not generally accepted, but it is supported by weighty considerations: (*1*) It is the one required by the immediate context. The author of this verse would not have considered the abbreviation of human life an expedient calculated to undo the mischief wrought by the sons of God. (*2*) Since, as already intimated, the story, in its present form and setting, was evidently intended to explain and justify the Deluge, the penalty threatened must be the destruction of mankind by that catastrophe. The most plausible objection is that, between the birth of Shem in Noaḥ's five hundredth and the Flood in his six hundredth year there is not room for the given interval (Tuch); but this is invalidated by the fact that, as has already been explained, vi. 1–8 is not a continuation of chapter v., and therefore must not be expected to harmonize with it.* The early authorities, Jewish and Christian, then, were correct in regarding this third verse as a

ing בשר. The principal objection to the first interpretation is that ש for אשר is late Hebrew, or Aramaic, and therefore not in place in the Pentateuch (Dillmann); but (*1*) the lateness of ש is not undisputed (Moore on Jud. v. 7), and (*2*) if it is late, so in all probability is this verse. Comp. Budde.

* A similar mistake is made when, in arguing against the view that the number a hundred and twenty is the measure of the individual human life, the cases of Abraham, Sarah, etc., are cited; since the data on which the objection is based all come from the Priestly narrative. Comp. Delitzsch.

prediction of the Flood and its terrible consequences. Comp. Dillmann. The respite was naturally explained as an evidence of the longsuffering of God (1 Pet. iii. 20) and an opportunity for Noaḥ to preach righteousness to the ungodly (2 Pet. ii. 5).

4. The author of *v.* 3 evidently condemned the course of the sons of God as wicked and calamitous. In the statement that now follows there is no trace of condemnation. Like the account of Lemekh's departure from monogamy (iv. 19 ff.) and that of Noaḥ's discovery of wine (ix. 20 ff.), it is a passionless record of an interesting tradition. It says that **the giants** * **were**, perhaps *arose*, **in those days**. These words in themselves would not connect the giants with the sons of God as their offspring, but the clause **when the sons of God came to the daughters of men** has no significance unless it establishes such a relation.† These giants were **the heroes**, men of might and prowess, who, by their achievements, **of old** had become **the men of renown**. In other words they corresponded to the demigods of classical mythology.

5. Toward the end of the appointed interval **Yahweh saw that the wickedness of men**, stimulated by the lawlessness of the sons of God, **was great in the earth**, that, indeed, **every design of the thoughts of their hearts**, as expressed in their conduct, **was only and always evil**. In such a case specifications become superfluous.

* The derivation of the word so rendered, נְפִלִים, is uncertain, but the meaning is clear from Num. xiii. 33, where, however, *the sons of 'Anaḳ from the giants* is a gloss. See the Greek Version.

† The phrase **and also afterward** might be explained as referring to the interval between the date of the first intermarriages and that of the Flood (Delitzsch), but it is more probably an interpolation suggested by Num. xiii. 33 (Budde).

6. The effect upon Yahweh is described in picturesque anthropomorphisms from which the unsophisticated reader cannot fail to get a vivid impression of the extent of the corruption that prevailed. First, he was **sorry that he had made men** at all, and his grief over their waywardness went **to his heart.**

7. This feeling finally gave way to anger, and he declared, **I will wipe men off the face of the ground.***

8. But one was found worthy of being excepted from this stern decision. **Noah,** for a reason that will appear hereafter (vii. 1), **found favor in the eyes of Yahweh.**

The story of the "sons of God" in its natural and necessary interpretation has been a stumbling-block to many devout readers of the Scriptures. One who has studied the preceding chapters in the light of recent oriental discoveries, however, and noted the traces of foreign, especially Babylonian, influence therein contained, will not be greatly surprised at finding here a decidedly mythological coloring. Nor will it disturb his reverence for the Old Testament as a whole, or his appreciation of this particular passage; for he will have noted that, although the reality of the gods and demigods of the gentiles is here taken for granted, they are presented in such a light as to prevent the thoughtful Hebrew from placing them on an equality with the Holy One of Israel, and he will contemplate with growing admiration the moral insight

* It is men with whom Yahweh is angry. They alone, therefore, should be threatened with destruction. In the present text, however, animals of all sorts share in the divine displeasure. The discrepancy has been produced by the insertion of a list of specifications, proper enough after such an expression as *all flesh* but not after *men*, to bring this verse more nearly into accord with vii. 21 and other like passages from a different source (P). The clause **whom I have created**, also, is an interpolation.

that enabled the author so clearly to perceive the rottenness of the foundation of the ethnic religions.

The central figure in the rest of this and the next three chapters is the patriarch Noaḥ. The whole may therefore appropriately be discussed under the title

3. Noah and his Times (vi. 9–ix. 29),

the proper equivalent for **the generations of Noaḥ** in this connection.

The greater part of the narrative is devoted to a composite account of

a. The Deluge (vi. 9–ix. 17);

which naturally falls into three sections, the first dealing with

(1) The Preparations of Noaḥ (vi. 9–vii. 5). It is composed of two parts, each of which recounts the steps taken by the patriarch under the divine direction to save himself and his family from destruction by the Flood.

(a) *The First Account* (vi. 9–22), derived from the Priestly narrative, seems to have been incorporated into the text entire.

9. It begins with a statement with reference to the character of Noaḥ, declaring that he was **a just,*** **a perfect man,** and therefore conspicuous **among his fellows,** lit. *in his generations.* Like Ḥanokḥ (v. 22) he also **walked with God.**

10. The author does not say that his **three sons,** whose birth was recorded in v. 32, were as remarkable for their piety as their father, but he probably thought of them as having profited by the patriarch's example. Comp. ix. 18 ff. (J).

* The Samaritans connect צדיק, *just*, which Ball is inclined to pronounce a gloss borrowed from vii. 1, with תמים, *perfect*, by a ו, *and*.

11. Not so the rest of mankind; for **the earth**, here put for its inhabitants, in spite of his piety **became corrupt**, morally ruined. The prevalent corruption showed itself in **violence**, disregard of the rights of one's fellows, the prevailing sin of godless ages and communities.

12. The corruption described was not confined to mankind. The lower animals learned to hunt and devour one another. Comp. Strack. Thus **all flesh had** finally **perverted its way**, changed the course of nature and temporarily defeated the benevolent purpose of the Creator.

13. God was not slow to discover a remedy. He says to Noaḥ, **The end**, the destruction (Am. viii. 1), **of all flesh hath come before me.** He has set it before himself as an object to be accomplished. Comp. Am. ix. 4, etc. He purposes to **destroy them**, the individuals responsible for the state of things described, **and* the earth**; or, as the sequel shows, destroy them and devastate the earth.†

14. Thus far there has been no intimation with reference to the means by which mankind are to be destroyed. It now appears that it is to be done by water, for God instructs Noaḥ to build **an ark**, *i. e.*, as in Ex. ii. 3, a box that will float on the water.‡ It is to be made of a wood

* With the Greek Version, the original of which seems to have had ואת instead of the את, *with*, of the present Hebrew text. The Syriac has על, *on*.

† It is interesting to note that the word שחת, here used in the sense of *destroy*, is the same that appeared above in that of *corrupt* and *pervert*. If a paronomasia was intended, a similar effect could be produced in English by using *pervert* throughout for the offence and *subvert* for the penalty.

‡ The fact that Noaḥ is represented as escaping by a box, and not, like the hero of the Babylonian deluge, in a ship or houseboat, has been supposed to indicate that the Hebrew story originated inland; but it is quite as probable that the author by the term here

whose identity is in dispute; probably **cypress**, which was anciently very common in western Asia, and was much used by the Egyptians for coffins and by the Phœnicians in shipbuilding. See Tristram, *NHB*, 356. Comp. Cheyne, *ZAW*, 1898, 163 f. The ark is to be constructed **in cells**,* doubtless for the accommodation of the various species of animals and their subsistence; and the seams stopped by smearing it outside and in with **bitumen**, the mineral pitch which is found in large quantities in both Palestine (xiv. 10) and Mesopotamia (xi. 3).

15. Noaḥ also receives instructions with reference to the size of the ark. The length prescribed is **three hundred cubits**. The Hebrews seem to have had cubits of two different lengths, the one a handbreadth longer than the other (Eze. xl. 5). If the cubit here meant was the longer of the two, and, as there are reasons for supposing, approximately identical with the "royal cubit" of the Babylonians, it measured about 495 millimetres or 19.49 inches. See Benziger, *HA*, art. *Elle;* comp. Riehm. The length of the ark would thus be 148.5 metres or 487.2 feet. Its breadth, **fifty cubits**, in modern terms would be 24.75 metres or 81.2 feet, and its height, **thirty cubits**, 14.85 metres or 48.72 feet.†

used meant to intimate that in the time of the patriarch ships were unknown.

* Lagarde suggests the insertion of a second קנים, which, however, would only emphasize the idea expressed by the present text. The Babylonian Noaḥ divided his ship into sixty-three compartments. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. i. 232 ff.; Appendix, ll. 62 ff.

† The largest modern steamships (600–700 ft.) are much longer than the ark, but, since they are not nearly so wide or deep, they have not an equal capacity (1,927,394.38 cu. ft.). The "Great Eastern," however, surpassed it in all three dimensions, being 680 feet long, 82.5 feet wide, and 58 feet deep. On the dimensions of the Babylonian ark, see Johns in *The Expositor* for April, 1901.

16. Provision for **light** and air is to be made by **finishing it** — not a window (Dillmann), but the ark — **within a cubit of the top**, thus leaving an opening a cubit wide around the entire vessel under the roof.* The only door in the structure is to be placed **in the side of the ark**. Finally the interior is to be divided horizontally by floors making **a lower, a second, and a third story**, each of them, if equal in height, being about sixteen feet high.†

17. Having finished this description of the ark, God announces in so many words that he will bring **the Flood**,‡ so called in anticipation of the prominence to be given to it by mankind, **upon the earth**, or that part of it not already covered with water. His purpose is the destruction,§ with the exception hereafter to be made, of all land life. That there may be no doubt about his meaning, he defines the phrase **all flesh** by **in which is a living spirit**, and then employs, to emphasize the whole thought, the familiar Hebrew device, repetition:

* This is the natural interpretation of the present text. It also seems to suit the context. There is therefore no necessity for importing from the Arabic a meaning (*roof*) for צהר, or recasting אל־אמה תכלנה, *to a cubit thou shalt finish it*, into אל־ארכה, תכסנה *to its length thou shalt cover it.* Comp. Ball.

† The entire floor-space would thus be 118,681.92 square feet. The question whether a vessel answering to the dimensions here given would accommodate the cargo for which it was designed, is of importance only to those who feel obliged to insist that the story of the Flood is in all its details authentic history. The ship of Babylonian legend had seven stories. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. i, 232 f.; Appendix, l. 62.

‡ The word מים, *water*, of the present text appears to be a gloss on the perhaps unfamiliar term מבול, *Flood.*

§ For the לשחת of the received text the Samaritans read לשחית or להשחית. On the latter form, see Ges. § 53, 3, R 7; on the construction, § 114, 2, R 4.

all that is in the earth, he says, **shall perish**. This, of course, implies a universal deluge.

18. The decree consigning to destruction the corrupt mass of mankind is immediately followed by a token of God's satisfaction with the patriarch: **I will establish**, enter into, **my**, *i. e.*, a, **covenant with thee**. This covenant, however, though made with Noaḥ alone, is to affect the fortunes of his entire family; for the command (and promise) reads, **thou shalt go into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and the wives of thy sons with thee**.*

19. Nor is this all. For his sake God proposes to provide for the perpetuation of **all the beasts**,† in this case all the varied species of the animal world. To this end the patriarch is instructed to **bring into the ark a male and a female** of each kind.

20. Three classes of animals are enumerated, **the birds, the cattle, and‡ all**, the multitude of, **the creeping things**. The author seems to have felt that the term used in the preceding verse made it unnecessary to make express mention of "the beasts of the earth." In *v.* 19 Noah is commanded to *bring* the animals into the ark; here God says they shall **come** to him, as if, scenting danger, and, as is still their habit, seeking

* The idea of Valeton (*ZAW*, 1892, 7), that the covenant here proposed is the same as that of chapter ix., is clearly mistaken. This is made with Noaḥ as a pledge of his escape from the impending deluge; that, with him and his descendants after the Flood, as security against the recurrence of such a calamity. See ix. 9 ff.

† החיה, with the Samaritans, instead of the החי, *living thing*, of the received text. See viii. 17; comp. iii. 20; viii. 21.

‡ This is the Greek, the Syriac, and the Samaritan reading; the received text omits the connective.

human protection, they would take refuge with him, **to be kept alive**.*

21. Noaḥ, for his part, has to provide for their sustenance, as well as his own, by collecting an indefinite quantity of **every food that is eaten**.

22. The patriarch, being "a perfect man," exact in his obedience to the divine will, **did just as God had commanded him**.

(b) *The Second Account* (vii. 1–5), which is of Yahwistic origin, is but a fragment. The part that dealt with the ark and its construction, with which it doubtless once began, and by which it was connected with vi. 8, has been omitted, probably because it would have been a mere repetition of vi. 14–16.

1. In its present form it assumes that the ark has already been completed. It begins as if the command in vi. 18 had not already been given and the persons affected by it enumerated. **Yahweh** — mark the name for the Deity — says to Noaḥ, **Come thou, and all thy house, into the ark**. There is no reference to a covenant made or proposed, but the reason given by Yahweh for his command, **thee have I found righteous before me in this generation**, amounts to the recognition of an obligation to reward the patriarch for his exceptional piety.

2. Thus far, therefore, there is practical agreement between the two accounts. The instructions now given with reference to the animals differ from those of the first account: first, in making a distinction among them; and second, in adding to the number to be taken from one of the classes thus distinguished. Thus, a part of

* The emphasis on the subject in *v.* 20 favors this interpretation.

the animals are characterized as **clean**, *i. e.*, as appears from viii. 20, suitable for sacrifices to the Deity as well as for food for mankind, *viz.*, sheep, goats, etc. This distinction — which is not surprising in the present connection, the teaching of the Yahwist being that the use of animals for the purposes mentioned was an immemorial custom (iii. 21 ; iv. 4) — would have been out of place in the other account, since, according to the Priestly narrator, animals were not slain for either purpose until after the Flood (i. 29; ix. 3). Of these clean animals Noaḥ is directed to take **by sevens**. The meaning of this phrase is disputed. The more natural interpretation makes it mean, not seven pairs (Dillmann), but seven individuals of each species, or three pairs of **a male and his mate**,* to secure a comparatively rapid restoration of these useful species, and an odd male for the sacrifice by which the patriarch is to celebrate his deliverance (viii. 20). This view is favored by the fact that, in the latter half of the verse, **by twos** † evidently means a single pair of each species.

3. The phraseology of the received text might be interpreted to mean that all the species of birds are to be represented in the ark by sevens ; but viii. 20 makes it evident that this was not the author's idea, and there is good authority for believing that the original reading was, **of the clean birds of heaven by sevens, and of all the birds that are not clean by twos.**‡ The dis-

* Compare *a male and a female*, the expression used by P in vi. 19.

† The present text has שנים, *two*, but the Samaritan reading is שנים שנים, and it is supported by the Greek and Syriac versions.

‡ The reading *clean birds* is supported by the Greek, Syriac, and Samaritan texts : but, if this is genuine, the Greek Version is doubtless correct in adding the parallel clause prescribing the number of unclean birds to be admitted to the ark.

tinction between clean and unclean it was as important to notice in connection with the birds as with the cattle; but it was not necessary to repeat the requirement that Noaḥ should select alternately **a male and a female**. It is therefore probable that this phrase, which, moreover, is in the later style of the Priestly narrator (vi. 19), is an interpolation.* The expression **the whole earth** shows that the Yahwist also thought of the deluge as universal.

4. Yahweh gives his servant **seven days** in which to bestow the animals and the food necessary for their sustenance in the ark. At the end of that time, he says, he intends to cause **a rain**, in itself not a remarkable phenomenon, by which, owing to its duration, **forty days and forty nights**, he will **wipe** all his creatures **off the face of the earth**. The idea of the author evidently is that, at the end of that time, the work of destruction having been completed, the deluge will cease. See *v.* 17; viii. 6; comp. *v.* 24; viii. 3 f.

5. This verse is only a less formal duplicate of vi. 21.

When all things were finally in readiness, God sent the deluge, as he had threatened. Much of the rest of the story is devoted to

(2) The Water of the Flood (vii. 6–viii. 14): the havoc wrought by it and the experiences of Noaḥ while it covered the earth. Here, too, the narrative is composite, but the extracts of which it is composed are too brief to be treated as separate paragraphs. The only further division that seems warranted is based on the phenomena of the rise and subsidence of the water. From this point of view there are two sections, the first of which describes

* In the Samaritan Pentateuch this idiom has been substituted in *v.* 2 for that preserved in the Massoretic text.

(a) *A Destructive Prevalence* (vii. 6–24). 6. It opens with a statement of the age of Noaḥ, **six hundred years**, when the Flood occurred. This statement clearly belongs to the chronological scheme, original with the Priestly narrator, which ran through the preceding chapters and furnishes a framework for the present story.

7. This general statement was originally followed by the precise date of the beginning of the deluge in *v.* 11. In the present composite narrative the connection between the two is interrupted, first, by a notice of the embarkation of Noaḥ and his family anticipating a more detailed account of the same incident in *vv.* 12–16. The words, **And Noaḥ went into the ark on account of**, through fear of, **the water of the Flood**, are attributed to the Yahwist; the rest is probably editorial elaboration. Comp. *v.* 1.

8. The description of the embarkation of the animals, also, being intended to harmonize *vv.* 2 f. with vi. 19, is of editorial origin. It recognizes the distinction between the clean and the unclean, but, following *v.* 3, omits to apply it to the birds as well as the cattle.*

9. It is not probable that the author of the last verse would follow *vv.* 2 f. so closely as he has thus far and contradict that passage before he finished the sentence. Hence one must conclude that in this verse **by twos** refers, not to the number of each species of animal that went into the ark, but to the number that went abreast in the procession. Perhaps — and the addition of **a male and a female** seems to favor this view — the author also interpreted *by sevens* in *v.* 3 as meaning

* For וכל, *and all*, the Samaritans read ומכל, *and of all*, and the latter, being the more natural and having the support of the Greek and Syriac versions, is doubtless the correct reading.

seven pairs. The last clause, with **Jahweh**,* naturally attaches itself to *v.* 7.†

10. At the end of **the seven days** granted Noaḥ for his final preparations (*v.* 4), when he had taken refuge in the ark (*v.* 7), **the water of the Flood was**, began to be, **on the earth**; the threatened rain set in.

11. The Priestly author now resumes his precise and detailed description of the embarkation. See *v.* 6. The month, **the second**, and even the day, **the seventeenth**,‡ on which the Flood began are carefully noted. The Hebrew year originally began in the fall; and, since the author elsewhere (Ex. xii. 2) distinctly attributes the change in the method of reckoning to Moses, he would naturally reckon from Tishri in the period preceding the advent of the lawgiver. Comp. Gunkel. The second month would thus be Bul (1 Kgs. vi. 38), later Marḥeshwan, beginning about the middle of October; so that the seventeenth of the month would come about the first of November, when the rainy season in Palestine and the neighboring countries usually sets in.§ **On that day all the sluices of the great deep**, the openings by

* This is the Samaritan reading and it is supported by the Targum and the Vulgate.

† Some manuscripts of the Greek Version have the equivalent of the pronoun *him* instead of the name *Noaḥ*, and, when the clause was attached to *v.* 7, the former may have been the Hebrew reading.

‡ According to the Greek Version it was *the twenty-seventh*. The Priestly narrator always omits the word יום, *day*, when the number is ten or less, but always inserts it — on Lev. xxiii. 5, see the Greek and Samaritan reading — with a larger number. Hence the question here is, whether the translators mistook עשר ים for עשרים, or a later copyist omitted the terminal ים in עשרים ים; and it seems to defy solution.

§ The following table, copied from the author's *Amos*, furnishes

which the Hebrews represented the "water under the earth" (Ex. xx. 4; Ps. xxiv. 2; Am. vii. 4) as brought to the surface, **were rent open**, suddenly and violently enlarged, perhaps multiplied, to emit an unprecedented volume of water. There is no reference to a tidal wave or any similar phenomenon. Comp. Dawson, *EL W*, 94. In addition **the windows of heaven**, the openings in the solid expanse by which God had divided the primeval watery waste (i. 6), were **undone**, to empty the water of the celestial reservoir upon the earth.

12. With the foregoing description, which makes the Flood an immediate miracle, compare the simple and characteristic statement of the Yahwist, that **the rain was**, *i. e.*, it rained, **on the earth forty days and forty nights**.*

13. In *vv.* 7 and 10 the idea seems to be that Noaḥ embarked before the date set for the beginning of the Flood. Here the Priestly narrator says that the patriarch waited until the last moment, entering the ark **on that very day**, he and his family **with him**.†

a correct idea of the limits as well as the character of the rainy season in Palestine:

Months.....	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.
Rainy days..	1.50	5.31	9.04	10.28	10.43	8.51	5.45	1.59
Ins. of rain..	0.514	1.664	4.718	5.479	5.207	3.531	1.448	0.199

* The Babylonian story, also, represents the agency by which the Flood was produced as a storm; one, however, which lasted only six days and nights. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 238 f.; Appendix, ll. 96 ff.

† The singular, referring to Noaḥ, with the Greek and Syriac versions, instead of אתם, *with them*, *viz.*, his sons, the reading of the received text. The connective should also, according to the Samaritans, be omitted between the names *Shem* and *Ḥam*. See v. 32; vi. 10. On the gender of the numeral שלשת, see Ges. § 97, 1, R.

14. Moreover, he appears to teach that all the **beasts, cattle, creeping things** and **birds** were put aboard the same day.

15. They came **by twos**, in pairs, **of all flesh**,* from all the species without exception.†

16. All this did Noaḥ, **as God had commanded him**; **and Yahweh shut him in.** The last clause is evidently a Yahwistic fragment. If so, however, it must originally have preceded *v.* 10, where the storm is represented as having already begun. It naturally attaches itself to the last clause of *v.* 9.

17. The next clause is usually interpreted as a reiteration of the substance of *vv.* 10 and 12, the phrase **forty days** being a harmonistic addition. ‡ The "dreadful monotony" (Delitzsch) thus produced can, and should, be relieved by referring the whole clause to the compiler, and interpreting the *forty days* as the measure, not of the duration of the Flood, as it is naturally understood in *v.* 12, but of the length of the first stage in the rise of the water. The meaning of the verse in its present form, therefore, is that, when the Flood had lasted the forty days of *v.* 12, **the water** had **increased** to such a depth that **it lifted the ark off the earth.** §

18. The Priestly parallel to 17b occupies the next three verses. For *increased* it has **prevailed**, grew in power as well as in volume, **and increased greatly.**

* The article before בשר, *flesh*, in the received text is contrary to the usage of this writer (vi. 12, 17, 19), and should be omitted. So the Samaritans.

† The Babylonian Noaḥ took with him into his ship, besides his family and relatives, cattle and beasts of the field and artisans of all sorts. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 234 f.; Appendix, ll. 85 ff.

‡ Budde (*BU*, 262 ff.), however, explains ארבעים יום as a corruption of מים, *water*.

§ On the construction, see v. 3; Ges. § 111, R 3.

19. These are strong terms, yet they do not seem to the author adequately to describe the mighty volume of the destroying element. The water, he declares, prevailed **very greatly**, surpassed all bounds, **so that all the high**, *i. e.*, highest **mountains**, not only in the region in which Noaḥ had lived, but **under all heaven, were covered**, completely submerged. Comp. Delitzsch.

20. And still the water rose; nor was its all-engulfing increase checked until it had reached the height of **fifteen cubits** farther **upward, and the mountains**, even the highest, **were covered** to that depth. Thus it was possible for the ark, which seems to have had a draft of about fifteen cubits (viii. 4), to float over the highest peaks.

21. The destruction wrought was world-wide and complete. **All flesh that moved on the earth perished**, not only the animals of every sort, but **all mankind**.

22. The Yahwist tells the same story in other words. **Every thing**, he says, **in whose nostrils was the breath of life** * (ii. 7) **on the dry land**, *i. e.*, exclusive of the fishes, **died**.

23. **Thus**, adds the same writer, **Yahweh** † **wiped out**, as in vii. 4 he threatened to do, **all the beings that were on the face of the ground**. An editorial hand has amplified this statement by inserting details borrowed from the Priestly narrative, as in vi. 7, and repeating, **they were wiped off the earth**. The Yahwist con-

* The received text has נשמת רוח חיים, *the breath of the spirit of life*, a combination of the original reading, נשמת חיים, *the breath of life* (ii. 7), with the corresponding Priestly expression, רוח חיים, *the spirit of life* (vi. 17).

† The divine name is wanting in the received text, probably through the carelessness of a copyist. Comp. Budde (*BU*, 266), who supposes the compiler to have omitted it for some unknown reason.

cludes this part of his story with the words, **and there were left only Noah and those that were with him in the ark**.*

24. The statement with which the Priestly narrator closes this part of his description of the Flood has been misinterpreted. When he says that **the water prevailed** for a certain length of time, he does not mean that it remained at or above a given height (Murphy) during that period. In *vv.* 18–22 *prevail* denotes increase in power with increase in volume, and there is no warrant for giving it a different signification in this connection. Indeed, the fact that, according to this author, the sluices of the deep and the windows of heaven were not closed until the end of the given period (viii. 2 f.) makes it necessary to conclude that he here intends to say that the height reached by the water was reached by a continuous rise lasting **a hundred and fifty days**. See also 17a, the insertion of which can only be explained on this supposition.

The rise just described finally reached its limit and was followed by

(b) *A Gradual Subsidence* (viii. 1–14). 1. The turning-point, according to the Priestly narrator, was reached when **God remembered Noah**, and his covenant to save the patriarch and the remaining occupants of the ark.† Then he **caused a wind to pass over the earth**, and as a result **the water fell**, or, strictly speaking, began to fall. See Ex. xiv. 21; Num. xii. 31 (J).

* See Budde (*BU*, 267). Dillmann refers the clause to *A* (P), while Holzinger (*Gen.*) pronounces it composite; but its brevity and simplicity show that neither of these views is tenable.

† The Syriac Version adds the birds, and the Greek both them and the creeping things.

2. The wind, however, would have been ineffectual, had not the sources of the inundation been stopped. The writer therefore adds that, at the same time, **the sluices of the deep and the windows of heaven were closed**. The Yahwist seems not to have known of the miraculous wind. He accounts for the subsidence of the water by simply noting that **the rain from heaven**, by which the deluge was caused, **ceased**.

3. He then proceeds to say that, from that time, which, as appears from vii. 12, was at the end of forty days from the beginning of the Flood, **the water continually withdrew**. This was the thought of the Yahwist; but the Priestly narrator consistently dated the beginning of the subsidence **from the end** * **of a hundred and fifty days**, and his view is here adopted by the compiler.

4. During this long and anxious period God had not really forgotten his servant. While the water was rising he was steering the ark to the spot where it would soonest find anchorage. The result was that **in the seventh month, on the seventeenth** † **of the month**, or, if one reckon thirty days to the month, as this author seems to have done, on the very day the water began to subside, **the ark grounded**. The place thus divinely selected was in **the mountains**, not the mountain, **of 'Ararat**, the Urartu of the Assyrians, a country lying on the Araxes (Aras) east of Lake Van. See Schrader, *KAT*, 52 f.; *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Ararat*. Among the mountains of that region is one, called by the Armenians Massis, which is commonly identified with that on which the ark rested.

* For קִצָּה, read קֵץ, the proper form of the word meaning *end* in temporal clauses. So the Samaritans, here and in Deu. xiv. 28. See also xvi. 3 (P).

† Here, as in vii. 11, the Greek Version has *the twenty-seventh*.

It is nearly 17,000 feet high, and consequently covered with perpetual snow. It has a rival in Mt. Judi, in Kurdistan, southwest of Lake Van, which is favored by orientals, both Jew and Christian.* Wherever the mountains here meant were, they were evidently the highest with which the author was acquainted, and, in his view, the highest in existence.

5. The first stage in the decrease of the water was completed **in the tenth month**, **on the first of the month**,† when **the tops of the mountains**, these highest, including the one on which the ark lay, **appeared**. Taken strictly, this would mean that the water fell a little more than fifteen cubits in about seventy-four days.

6. There follows a verse whose original meaning is clear. It is evidently from the hand of the Yahwist. The **forty days**, therefore, must originally, as in vii. 4 and 12, have been the forty days of the storm; the idea of the author being, that **Noaḥ opened the window of the ark** as soon as the rain ceased. Comp. Lenormant, *BH*, 414. In its present setting it means something entirely different. The forty days would naturally be interpreted as the next forty after the date last mentioned,

* For an account of an ascent of Mt. Ararat, see Allen & Sachtleben, *AAB*, 43 ff. The identification of the place where Noaḥ landed with Mt. Judi is supported by the authority of the Targum and the Syriac Version. Berosus in his version of the Babylonian account of the Flood, also, represents Xisuthros as landing in the region of the latter. See Cory, *AF*, 63. The original, however, says that the ship in which he was saved grounded on Nisir, a mountain elsewhere described as beyond the Tigris between the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth parallel of latitude. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 238 ff.; *KAT*, 53; Appendix, l. 141; *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Ararat*.

† The Greek translators seem to have understood *until the tenth month* as meaning until the end of it; hence they changed the date of the appearance of the mountains to the first of *the eleventh month*. See ii. 2.

the first of the tenth month; and this must have been the idea of the compiler, although it seems strange that, if the mountains, including the one on which the ark lay, were already visible at the beginning of the period, the dove should not have found a resting-place when released at the end of it (*v.* 9).* There is no other interpretation to which there are not equally serious objections. Thus, if the forty days be reckoned from the seventeenth of the seventh month (Dillmann), even on the supposition that the first dove was not released until seven days after the raven, the second will have brought the olive branch to Noaḥ twenty (74 — 54) days before the tops of the mountains were visible. The clause **that he had made**, of course, refers, not to the ark, but to the window, of the oriental pattern, in it.† Comp. vi. 16.

7. It has been suggested that the window was in the roof, so that Noaḥ could not see his surroundings (Budde), and that this is the reason he employed the birds as his messengers; but *v.* 13 seems unfavorable to this supposition. A more probable explanation is, that he wished a larger knowledge of the situation than his own eyes could give him. To this end, according to the text, he first sent out **a raven**, one of the strongest of wing and keenest of eye among his feathered companions. But the bird, being comparatively wild, and able to subsist on the carrion which still floated on the water, **went to and**

* This difficulty is relieved by the fact that, in the Babylonian story the first two birds return to the ship without finding a resting-place, although Mt. Nisir had appeared as an island a week before the first of them had been sent forth. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 238 ff.; Appendix, ll. 140 ff.

† The definiteness of the expression does not necessarily indicate that this window was the only one in the ark (Dillmann). The article is used in the sense of *a certain* to designate a person or object as the one in the author's mind. See *v.* 7; Ges. § 126, 4.

fro continually,* never coming back to the ark, **until the water dried off the earth** and its mate also was released.

8. The natural inference from the close connection between *vv.* 6 and 7 is, that the raven was set free immediately after the rain had ceased. It now becomes a question, how long Noaḥ waited for the return of the raven before he despatched his second messenger, **a dove**. This verse, in its present form, contains no information on the subject: a fact which, in view of the care with which the rest of the story (*vv.* 10, 12) is articulated, seems significant. It has been explained by saying that, either by accident or design, a temporal clause that once began this verse has been omitted.† This, however, is not the only explanation that suggests itself. A better one is based on the supposition that the verse is the original continuation of *v.* 6; a supposition supported

* The Greek and Latin versions have the equivalent of ויצא ולא שב, *and it went forth and returned not*, and this is the reading adopted by Ball; but the Samaritans have substantially the received text, merely substituting finite verbs for the two infinitives, and the Syriac Version, although it follows the Greek so far as to render the second infinitive by a finite verb with the negative, has preserved the first as in the Hebrew idiom. Moreover, as Holzinger suggests, the following clause seems to forbid any change in the text.

† So Budde (*BU*, 272) and others. Ball first rearranges the text by removing *v.* 7 from its present position and inserting it after *v.* 9; then connects the two by supplying *and he waited seven days* at the beginning of the former. One of the reasons given for the transposition is, that the whole passage relative to the birds is thus brought into agreement with the Chaldean account. The alleged agreement, however, does not result; for the raven remains the second of four, whereas, in the Babylonian account it is the last of three, birds released. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 240 f.; Appendix, ll. 153 f.

by two important considerations: (*1*) The raven has no proper place in the narrative, being of a different species from the rest of the birds, and having no necessary or clearly distinguishable function. (*2*) This verse gives, as *v.* 7 does not, but naturally would, if it were a part of the original story, the reason why Noaḥ sent forth the bird, *viz.*, **to see if the water had subsided**.* These reasons seem convincing. But omit *v.* 7, and *v.* 6 furnishes the date for the release of the dove. When the episode of the raven, which seems to have been suggested by the Babylonian story, was inserted, a temporal clause might have been added, but, if it had been the one suggested, it would have emphasized rather than relieved the difficulties in the chronology of the story.

9. The result of Noaḥ's first trial was what might have been expected. The dove returned, having found **no resting-place**, because, the rain having so recently ceased, **there was water on the face of the whole earth**. This statement conflicts with *v.* 5 (P), as has been shown, but it is in harmony with the rest of the Yahwistic narrative.

10. Noaḥ **waited† seven days more**: *i. e.*, in the original meaning of the words, seven days in addition to the forty that he had already spent in the ark: ‡ then **he again sent a**, possibly *the*, **dove forth from the ark**.

11. This time the dove, having found places to alight and rest, did not return until **eventide**, and then it came bringing **a fresh olive leaf**, one freshly plucked

* In the Greek Version the clause has been inserted in *v.* 7, but not omitted, as it should have been, from this one.

† For ויחל here and וַיְיַחֵל in *v.* 12 Olshausen and others read וַיְוַחֵל. Comp. Ball.

‡ This would be sufficiently clear without the words עוד and אחרים; hence it is possible that they are not original.

from a tree, **in its mouth**. Then Noaḥ, knowing that the olive did not grow in high altitudes, concluded that **the water had** greatly **subsided**.

12. After a second interval of seven days he set free a third dove, or the same bird a third time. It found the earth so nearly dry that it could procure food without difficulty, and **it did not return to him again**.

13. The Yahwist next told what Noaḥ did, when the dove failed to return as on the other occasions of its release; but his account is here interrupted by another bit of chronology from the Priestly narrative, to the effect that it was in **the six hundred and first year of the life of Noaḥ**,* and, indeed, **in the first month** and **on the first of the month**, when **the water had dried off the earth**, *i. e.*, as must be inferred from *v.* 14, had disappeared from the surface. Thus, while the Yahwist represents the water that fell during the forty days of the storm as subsiding in fourteen days, the Priestly narrator allows more time for the decrease than for the increase of the deluge; ninety of the one hundred and sixty-four days being required for its disappearance after the tops of the mountains became visible. Of these three months the last extract from the Yahwistic narrative is made to account for fifty-four days. Of the remaining thirty-six the compiler may have given from one to seven to the interval between *vv.* 7 and 8; the greater number would represent that after *v.* 12. The chronological data just given are followed by the sequel to *v.* 12, in which the Yahwist recites that, when Noaḥ perceived that the dove was not to return, he removed a part of **the covering of the ark**, perhaps the lid of a hatchway, and found that **the ground was dry**.

* The phrase *of the life of Noaḥ* is supplied from vii. 11 on the authority of the Greek Version.

14. The Yahwist apparently intends to represent Noaḥ as making the above discovery very soon after the failure of the dove to return to its cote. The compiler divided the verse for the purpose of bringing his sources into greater harmony. In this way it is made to appear that, although the dove left the ark not later than the first of the first month, Noaḥ did not act upon the natural inference from its disappearance until **the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month**, for not until that date, according to the Priestly narrator, **was the earth dry**. These fifty-six days, more or less, added to the number that had already elapsed, make the duration of the subsidence, in round numbers, two hundred and twenty, instead of fourteen days, and the length of time between the beginning and the end of the deluge about three hundred and seventy, instead of fifty-four days. Now the number three hundred and seventy does not tally with any measure of time known to have been in use among the Hebrews. It is therefore probable that the number one hundred and fifty, in vi. 24 and vii. 3, is a round number, that the months of this author are lunar months, and that the year and ten, or, counting both termini, eleven days, amounts to a solar year of three hundred and sixty-five days.*

* Compare Dillmann, who holds that the length of the Flood according to the Priestly narrator was originally twice a hundred and fifty, or three hundred days, and that *vv.* 13a and 14 represent a later theory; and Holzinger, who, on the other hand, declares vii. 24 and viii. 3b, the passages in which the number one hundred and fifty occurs, editorial additions. The Babylonians made the duration of the Flood much shorter than even the Yahwist. In the original of the story the total number of days seems to have been fourteen. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 238 ff.; Appendix, ll. 128 ff.; comp. Lenormant, *BH*, 416 f. This statement is based on the supposition that the birds were all set free on the same day;

When the water had subsided, Noaḥ and his companions found themselves in undisputed possession of the earth. God did not, however, permit them to enter upon their inheritance until he had instructed his servant with reference to

(3) The Future of the Survivors (viii. 15–ix. 17). Here, too, the narrative is twofold, but the component parts have been so arranged that the casual reader does not detect their duplicate character. The whole may be divided into three sections, the first of which, from the content of the Yahwistic extract incorporated with it, may be entitled

(a) *Noah's Offering* (viii. 15–22). 15. It opens with a description, in the characteristic style of thePriestly narrator, of the debarkation of the inmates of the ark.

16. In the command to **go forth from the ark** notice that Noaḥ's wife takes precedence of her sons. Comp. *v.* 18: also vi. 18; vii. (7), 13.

17. The number and order of the classes of animals that Noaḥ is instructed to **bring forth** * correspond to those of vi. 20. Comp. *v.* 19; vii. 14, 21 (23). It is God's will that they shall again, as before the Flood, **swarm in the earth**.

18. Comp. *v.* 16.

19. The text is doubtful,† but the meaning is clear:

such is the natural interpretation of the language used. Berosus, however, in his version of the story says that there was an interval of some days between the hero's attempts to learn the condition of the earth. See Cory, *AF*, 61.

* The form הֵיצֵא, which the Massoretes prefer to the original reading, Ball characterizes as "a mere fancy." Böttcher (§ 437, *f*), however, explains it as a case of dissimilation after הָאָרֶץ. See also Ps. v. 9/8.

† The reading adopted is that of the Samaritans, of which the received text appears to be a corruption explicable by supposing

viz., that all the animals preserved, in obedience to God's command, left the ark with Noaḥ. **The beasts** here include domestic animals, just as, in *v.* 17, the **cattle** include wild beasts. See i. 30; vi. 20.

20. In the present text *vv.* 15–19 serve as an introduction to an extract (*vv.* 20–22) from the Yahwistic narrative describing the sacrifice by which Noaḥ expressed his gratitude for deliverance. He had no sooner left the ark than he erected **an altar to Yahweh**, on which he offered the seventh of the animals (vii. 2) representing each of **the clean** species of **cattle** and **birds** in the ark, as **burnt offerings**, *i. e.*, offerings to be consumed entire, **on the altar**. This is the first mention of such offerings. Comp. iv. 4.

21. The patriarch's prompt and generous recognition of the divine hand in his experience did not remain unrewarded. **Yahweh**, says the author, using an anthropomorphism that sounds like a relic of Babylonian mythology,* but, strange to say, is of frequent occurrence in the Priestly narrative (Lev. i. 9, 13; etc.) † — Yahweh **smelled the pleasant odor, and**, touched by the devotion it symbolized, **said to himself**, lit. *to his heart*, **I will not again curse the ground**. The curse to which reference is here made is generally identified with the recent visitation (Dillmann). But, as has been repeat-

that a copyist by mistake transposed כל העוף and כל הרמש and then inserted a כל before רומש, without the article, to make it intelligible. The Greek Version has *and all the beasts, and all the cattle, and every bird, and every reptile moving on the earth;* the Syriac, *and all the beasts, and all the cattle, and all the birds, everything that creepeth on the earth.* The latter, without the second *and*, is Ball's reading.

* See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 240 f.; Appendix, ll. 160 ff.

† This fact shows that the expression does not necessarily imply sensuous notions of the Deity.

edly noticed, the Flood is not represented as producing any lasting effect upon the earth, and therefore could not properly be called a curse. Add to this, not only that the author of v. 29 connects this passage with iii. 17, but that the phraseology employed is evidently a reminiscence of the latter, and it seems reasonable to conclude that the author here intends to represent Yahweh as resolving not again to curse the ground, as he did when 'Adham fell, **on men's account**, for the purpose of punishing them. The next clause is capable of two or three interpretations, but it is usually regarded as a reason for the resolution just taken by Yahweh. This view, however, is forbidden by the situation. Mankind at this time, according to the author, consisted of eight persons, who had been spared because, while their fellows were utterly evil, Noaḥ at least was of the opposite character. The interpretation mentioned would imply that **the design of the hearts** of the patriarch and his family, also, was **evil from their youth**, from the age of accountability. This difficulty is avoided by treating the clause as explanatory of the preceding phrase, *on men's account*, reproducing the reason for the Flood as given in vi. 5. Yahweh is thus made to say that he will not again punish men as he did 'Adham on account of having become, or, to put it more idiomatically, though they become, as thoroughly evil as, following the example of 'Adham, they were when the Flood was decreed.* In vi. 5 f. Yahweh was so moved by the wickedness of men that he was sorry to have made them. Here the specta-

* In the above discussion it is taken for granted that the whole of *v.* 21 is by one author, a supposition that is favored by the interpretation proposed. If the curse of the first half of the verse is the Flood, according to Holzinger, who adopts this view, the originality of Yahweh's first resolution becomes questionable.

cle of the piety of his servant makes him regret that he has been so severe with them, and, as he recalls, to speak after the manner of the author, the multitude of men and animals that perished in the Flood, he adds, **nor will I again smite everything that liveth, as I have done**; which, however, does not imply that he will henceforth let sin, no matter how flagrant, go unpunished.*

22. These limitations imposed upon himself by Yahweh are followed by an express guaranty of the stability of nature. **While† the earth endureth**, lit. *all the days of the earth*, — and the earth is a favorite Hebrew symbol for stability and perpetuity (Ps. civ. 5), — **seedtime and harvest**, like **cold and heat**, characteristic marks of **summer and winter**, and **day and night shall not cease**. The Flood, it appears, even according to the Yahwist, was a serious disturbance of the order of nature.

The Priestly narrator now resumes his story with a paragraph detailing the instructions given to Noaḥ on

(b) *The Sacredness of Life* (ix. 1–7). 1. The beginning of the new era in the history of the race is signalized by a repetition of the blessing bestowed upon the first man and woman. The first part, **Increase and multiply, that ye may fill the earth**, is reproduced *verbatim*.‡ See i. 28.

2. The rest of it is slightly modified. In i. 28 man is encouraged to assert his lordship over the animals, as if they would instinctively recognize in him a superior being and peaceably submit to be controlled. The general

* In the Babylonian account this point receives attention. See Schrader, *KB*, 242 f.; Appendix, ll. 182 ff.

† For the עֹד, *still*, of the received text read, with the Samaritans, עַד, *until*.

‡ The Greek Version adds *and have mastery over it*.

corruption has made the fulfilment of this ideal impossible. Still, the brute must be held in subjection to humanity. God promises that he will inspire with **fear** and **dread** of mankind **the beasts of the earth** and **the birds of heaven**, and thus give them, as well as the smaller animals, **with which the ground teemeth**, and **the fish of the sea**, into man's hand.

3. Moreover, he decrees that **every moving thing that liveth** shall be man's **to eat**. **Like the green herb**, he says, **I give you** them **all**. The last clause is a reference to i. 29. It calls attention to the fact that, according to the Priestly narrative, man had not hitherto eaten flesh of any sort. Comp. Delitzsch. Now, however, he is given permission to slay and eat, not only the cattle, but animals of every species without exception. In other words, the author here expressly teaches that, in Noah's time, the distinction between clean and unclean, recognized by the Yahwist in vii. 2 and viii. 20, did not exist. His idea, as appears later in his work, was that this distinction, with the observance of it, was introduced by Moses. See Lev. xi. 1 ff.

4. There is but one restriction : **Flesh with its life**, *i. e.*, as is at once explained, **its blood**,* **ye shall not eat**. No instructions are given with reference to the disposal of the blood. The author cannot have thought of it as sacrificed, for sacrifices of all kinds, according to his theory, began with Moses. See Lev. xvii. 1 ff. He would doubtless have said it was poured upon the ground and covered with dust, as the law he attributes to Moses requires in the case of animals slain in hunting. See

* Ball treats דמו as a gloss ; but the use of דמכם, *your blood*, in *v.* 5, especially in view of its emphatic position, seems to favor the present reading.

Lev. xvii. 13.* On the relation of the blood to life, see further Lev. xvii. 10 ff. The prohibition includes not only flesh from living animals, but that of those not properly bled; *e. g.*, one that has died of disease or been killed by another. See Lev. xvii. 15. Compare the cruel or disgusting practices of various other ancient peoples.

5. The blood of beasts may be shed, when their flesh is required by men for food; but the shedding of men's blood is strictly prohibited, except in punishment for crime. If it is shed, God will **make demand** of the shedder for it; whether it be **any beast** that has slain a man, or **any one's brother**.

6. The penalty is one. **He**, whether beast or man, **that sheddeth men's blood, by men shall his blood be shed**. This law gives any member of the community to which the victim belonged, although the next of kin would be the natural avenger, the right to take the life of the homicide, and that without inquiring under what circumstances the deed to be avenged was committed. It is intended to mirror the supposed practice of the early Hebrews. For the modifications of the law which the author attributes to Moses, see Num. xxxv. 9 ff.† The reason given for the peculiar sacredness of men's lives is that they were made **in the image of God**.

7. It is theirs, not to kill and destroy one another, but to **multiply**, nay, **swarm, in the earth and exercise lordship ‡ over it**.

* Among the Arabs the pouring of the blood upon the ground was a sacrificial act, and so, in all probability, although the Priestly author thought otherwise, it was among the ancient Hebrews. See W. R. Smith, *RS*, 216 f.

† On the history and significance of the *lex talionis* among the early Semites, see W. R. Smith, *RS*, 33 f., 72, 254, 399.

‡ So Ball, following Nestle, in harmony with i. 28. The received text repeats רבו, *multiply*.

In the last paragraph from the Yahwistic narrative (viii. 20 ff.), although Yahweh is represented as taking a resolution with reference to his future treatment of mankind, there is no mention of a formal covenant, or even of the communication of the divine purpose to the patriarch. According to the Priestly narrator a covenant was made and proclaimed, the sign of which was

(c) *God's bow* (*vv.* 8–17). 8. Hitherto God has spoken to Noaḥ alone. He now reveals his gracious purpose to the patriarch and **his sons with him**.

9. The reason for so doing is that they are to be parties to the new covenant. Comp. vi. 18. Their **offspring**, the new race to spring from them, will inherit its benefits.

10. Finally, **all the living creatures** according to their classes, having shared with Noaḥ and his family the perils of the Flood and the preserving care of their Creator, are made partakers with mankind of the divine promise. The last clause is difficult, but the most natural interpretation is that it was meant to emphasize the inclusiveness of the covenant, the extremes being the human survivors **that go forth from the ark** (*v.* 9) and **the beasts of the earth** * just mentioned.

11. The content of the covenant is, that **all flesh shall not again be cut off by the water of a flood**: that, indeed, **there shall not again be a flood to ravage † the earth**. See viii. 21.

12. The establishment of this covenant is the free act

* The last phrase is wanting in the Greek Version. Holzinger, therefore, who insists upon interpreting it as meaning beasts in general, pronounces it an interpolation. He is then obliged to explain the מ of מכל, *from all*, as a case of dittography.

† For לשחת the Samaritans read להשחית. See vi. 17.

of the Almighty. **The sign of the covenant**, too, which, like the covenant, must endure **to endless generations**, is of his own choosing.*

13. The sign chosen he calls **my bow**. This expression reminds one of the Hindoo myth in which the bow used by Indra, in shooting bolts of lightning at his enemies, when the storm is over becomes the rainbow, a sign of peace to mankind.† See Dillmann. This bow God promises to place, not once for all, but, as the next verse explains, at indefinite intervals, **in the clouds**, to serve as a reminder of the covenant now established. The author apparently thought that hitherto there had been no such thing as a rainbow. There are those who undertake to defend this opinion (Keil). Few modern readers, however, will believe that the laws of light and the properties of the atmosphere were so different before the Flood from what they have been since, that in that early period a rainbow never followed a shower. Those, therefore, who are concerned to maintain the infallibility of the author generally adopt the less probable view, that he is here explaining the origin, not of the rainbow, but of its adoption as a sign (Murphy).

14. The reader cannot but be struck with the fitness of the rainbow, appearing as it does after a storm, to strengthen the faith of the patriarch in God's promise not again to destroy mankind or ravage the earth by a deluge. The author himself must have perceived its

* It seems clear that the relative clause was intended to describe the covenant; yet, owing doubtless to a confusion of the two ideas, the verb is not the one (קוּם III., *establish*) elsewhere found in such a connection, but the one (נתן, *give*) used of the promised sign. See *v.* 13; comp. *v.* 19.

† For a reference to the bow of Anu, the Babylonian god of heaven, see Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 32 f.

manward significance, but this is not the side that most impressed him. It was the Godward side that seemed to him most important. This must be borne in mind in the interpretation of the description of the conditions, **when I overspread the earth with a cloud**, under which the sign will become operative. The cloud is here, not a possible object of fear to mankind, but a convenient screen on which **the bow shall appear**.

15. The purpose of the sign is now stated: **that I**, not mankind, **may remember the covenant**, and that, as a result, **the water may not** continue to fall so long as to **become a flood destroying all flesh**.

16. This verse repeats the thought of the last two, emphasizing the anthropomorphic features of the representation.

17. Comp. *v.* 12.

The above discussion has made clear, (*1*) that the Hebrew story of the Flood is composite, and (*2*) that the two accounts interwoven to produce it present important variations. Incidentally it has been shown, also, (*3*) that the Babylonian story is a third account of the same event, differing in some respects from both, but most from the later, of the others.* This last, being the oldest of the three,† and therefore nearest to the event which they all describe, must be taken into account in

* For a comparative view of the three, see Schrader, *COT*, i. 58 ff.; Boscawen, *BM*, 114 ff.

† The tablets from which the modern world in 1872 derived its first knowledge of this story were written in the reign of Asshurbanipal (668–626 B. C.); but they were copies of others of much earlier origin. One recently found, which contains a fragment of the story, is dated in the reign of Ammi-saduga, who, according to the best authorities, flourished before 2000 B. C. See *Enc. Bib.* art. *Deluge*, 6; Jastrow, *RBA*, 507.

any attempt to determine the real nature of that event and the date of its occurrence. Now although this story, also, in its present form, represents the Flood as having destroyed all mankind except the occupants of Utnapishtim's vessel, there are indications that the original catastrophe was the destruction of a city called Shurippak on the lower Euphrates. It is therefore probable that a local inundation was the common foundation of the three accounts. It must have occurred long before 2348 B. C., the date of the Flood according to the Priestly narrator, as appears from the fact that the hero of the event is one, the last, of the ten kings of the prehistoric period.* This means that neither of the three accounts can be regarded as strictly historical. It does not, however, mean that they are all alike valueless. When they are compared as vehicles of moral and religious instruction, the superiority of the Hebrew accounts is at once apparent. The Babylonian story is polytheistic, and its gods are as capricious, jealous, and quarrelsome as those of the other ancient pantheons. Its hero is the favorite of one of these divinities. The Hebrew tradition, on the other hand, even in its oldest known form, is thoroughly monotheistic, and its God is a being whose character commands instant and unmixed reverence. Its hero is the man who alone won the favor of his God by his righteousness. The latter story would naturally have an effect upon those among whom it circulated as salutary as that of the other must have been unwholesome, and there can be no doubt that, in spite of its unhistorical

* According to Jastrow (*RBA*, 501 f., 506) the Babylonian story combines with the tradition of the destruction of Shurippak reminiscences of the destructive rains that flooded Babylonia annually before the completion of the system of canals for which the country was famous. Comp. *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Deluge*, 22.

features, it has been the means, under God, of deterring many from sin and confirming them in reverence for, and obedience to, their Maker.

The history of the patriarch closes with a passage, mostly from the Yahwistic narrative, which may be entitled

b. Noah's Prophecy (ix. 18–29).

18. Thus far the Yahwist has given no hint of the number of persons in Noaḥ's family. See vii. 1, 23. He now mentions three sons, giving them the same names as the Priestly narrator in v. 32, vi. 10, and vii. 13. In the present text there follows an explanation, **Ḥam was the father of Kena'an**. The reason for its insertion is evident. It was intended to prepare the reader for the story from another source, beginning with *v.* 20, in which Kena'an is the prominent figure. That story, in *v.* 22, contains another reference to the relation between Ḥam and Kena'an even more noticeable than the one found here. The gratuitousness of the latter arouses the suspicion that neither of them is original, that they were both inserted by a compiler for the purpose of harmonizing *vv.* 20 ff. with their present context; a suspicion strengthened by the fact that even now the harmony is not complete, since, while in this verse, as in the Priestly narrative (v. 32; vi. 10; vii. 13; x. 6 ff.), Ḥam is the second, in *v.* 24, if he is the offender, he is expressly called the youngest son of Noaḥ. The difficulty is explained, and with it the interpolations in question, by *vv.* 25 ff., whence it appears that, according to the author of the story, the patriarch's three sons were not Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth, but Shem, Yepheth, and Kena'an.*

19. **From these** as progenitors, all the rest of man-

* On the bearing of x. 21, see the comment on that passage.

kind having been destroyed by the Flood, **the whole earth**, or, more exactly, the new population of the globe, **spread themselves abroad**.*

20. The last two verses seem to have been the introduction to the Yahwistic (J^2) table of the nations, fragments of which are preserved in chapter x. There now follows them an extract from the same source (J^1) as iv. 17 ff. It recounts the experience of **Noaḥ the husbandman** as the planter of **the first vineyard**.†

21. In due time he gathered his grapes and made them into **wine**. Of this he drank, not knowing what would be the effect; whereupon **he became drunk** and, while in this condition, **exposed himself** where he lay **within his tent**.

22. Here, according to the received text, **Ḥam** found him. Originally however, as has been shown, it must have been **Kena'an** who **saw the nakedness of his father** and, instead of making haste to hide the patriarch's shame, as he should have done, **told his brethren**, Shem and Yepheth, apparently with indecent mirth or malice, what he had witnessed.‡ Comp. Holzinger. All this

* On נִפְצָה, see Ges. § 67, R 11; comp. Siegfried-Stade, art. נפץ.

† The text, literally rendered, reads, *Noaḥ the husbandman began and planted a vineyard.* Ball inserts לִהְיוֹת, *to be*, after נח in imitation of x. 8. But this makes the author say, contrary to iii. 20, that Noaḥ was the first husbandman, instead of what the context requires, that he was the first vintner. A happier suggestion is that of Budde (*BU*, 312), that the original reading was וַיְהִי נֹחַ אִישׁ אֲדָמָה וַיִּחֶל נֹחַ וְ׳ג, *and Noaḥ became a husbandman, and Noaḥ began*, etc., and that the text was changed to suit the new context, when the story was given its present place after that of the Flood. On the construction, see Ges. § 120, 2, a.

‡ The Greek Version has *he went forth and told*, and Ball adopts this reading; but his claim that בְּחוּץ, *without*, implies a preceding וַיֵּצֵא is not supported by usage, the example he cites (xxxix. 12)

implies that the three sons of Noaḥ were all young; which they cannot have been according to the author of either of the accounts of the Flood. This difficulty could be avoided by inserting the incident here narrated before the Flood; but then it would be impossible to explain the preservation of such a person as Kena'an. These considerations make it necessary to conclude that the work to which this story belonged did not contain an account of the Flood.

23. The two older brothers, with a filial reverence worthy of all praise, **took a cloak**, one of the ample outer garments often used by orientals as a covering at night (Ex. xxii. 25/26 f.), **and covered their father, their faces** meanwhile being modestly turned **backward**.

24. The close connection between this and the following verses requires that **his youngest son** should be interpreted as referring to Kena'an. Comp. Dillmann.

25. This being admitted, there is not the least difficulty in understanding the otherwise unjustifiable malediction, **Cursed be Kena'an**, which Noaḥ uttered when he learned what had happened. He cursed Kena'an, not because Kena'an was the youngest, and therefore presumably the dearest, son of Ḥam (Delitzsch), but because Kena'an himself was the offender. His fate is to be **the lowest of servants**, lit. *the servant of servants*,* to his brethren; *viz.*, as the following verses show, the other sons of Noaḥ, Shem and Yepheth. The reference to the subjugation of the Promised Land is unmistakable. Kena'an must, therefore, be interpreted, not in the broader sense of x. 15 ff., but like *Kena'anite* in xxiv. 3,

not presenting a parallel case. On the other hand, see Cant. viii. 1.

* On this idiom, see Cant. i. 1; Ges. § 133, 3, R 2.

etc., as including merely the primitive inhabitants of Palestine.*

26. Having cursed Kena'an, the patriarch takes occasion to pronounce a corresponding blessing upon each of his other sons, beginning with the elder. **Blessed of Yahweh**, he says, **be Shem**.† The use of the divine name dearest to the Hebrews in this connection indicates that Shem is here only another name for Israel, and this idea is confirmed when one considers the relation that he is henceforth to sustain to Kena'an. He is to be a master and Kena'an is to be **a servant to him**.‡ This was the precise relation between the Hebrews and the original occupants of the most of Palestine after the Conquest. See Jos. xvii. 13; Jud. i. 28, 30, 33; etc.

27. The second son receives the benediction, **May God**, not Yahweh the Holy one of Israel, **enlarge Yepheth**.§ The significance of these words is disputed. It has usually been taken for granted that the Yepheth

* The etymology of the name כנען, *K'na'an*, is doubtful. See *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Canaan*. Whatever its derivation, the author of this story doubtless connected it with כנע, *be humble*, and saw in it, as in שם, *Shem* (*Renown*), a presage of the destiny of the people who bore it.

† The received text has *Blessed be Yahweh the God of Shem;* but this leaves Shem without a blessing and makes Kena'an the servant of Yahweh. These difficulties are removed by adopting Budde's suggestion (*BU*, 294 ff.), that אלהי, *God of*, be omitted and *Yahweh* made the genitive, instead of the predicate, after *blessed*. See xxvi. 29.

‡ On למו, see Isa. xliv. 15; Ges. § 103, 2, n.

§ The verb יפת, *yapht*, furnishes an excellent example of paronomasia, which, however, cannot be rendered into English without taking undue liberty with the thought of the author. It is generally regarded as at the same time an etymology of Yepheth. Budde (*BU*, 358 ff.), however, derives the name from יפה, *be beautiful*, citing דלת, etc., as similar formations.

here meant is the Yepheth of x. 2, and, on the basis of this assumption, believed that the prayer of the patriarch was answered in the participation of some of the peoples which, according to x. 2 ff., sprang from Yepheth, in the power and glory of the ancient Shemitic empires (Dillmann), or the admission of the entire family through the Gospel to the spiritual benefits of the Kingdom of God (Delitzsch). If, however, as has been shown, there is no connection between this passage and either source of chapter x., and the names Shem and Kena'an must both be interpreted in a narrower sense here than there, it is fair to conclude that the Yepheth who is to **dwell in the tents of Shem**,* while Kena'an is to be **a servant to him** also, represents a people in or near Palestine. Wellhausen (*CH*, 14 f.) thinks it can only be the Philistines; but, as Budde (*BU*, 331 ff.) has shown, the Hebrews always regarded the Philistines as aliens, and the relations between the two peoples were from the first almost continuously unfriendly. See Jud. xiv. 3 f.; 1 Sam. ix. 16; xviii. 25; 2 Sam. v. 17 ff.; Isa. ix. 12; etc. Thus there was never a time when the expansion of Philistia could have been regarded as a thing to be desired by a loyal Hebrew. Compare the case of the Phœnicians. They, like the Hebrews, spoke "the language of Kena'an." The two peoples, although in some places they overlapped (Jud. i. 31 f.), seem never to have had any serious misunderstanding. When the monarchy was established, the relations between them became of the most cordial and profitable character (2 Sam. v. 11; 1 Kgs. v. 1 ff.); and the friendship continued for centuries, being sealed by royal intermarriages (1 Kgs. xi. 1;

* The view, dictated by Jewish prejudice, that the subject of יִשְׁכֹּן is *God*, is now generally abandoned. See, however, Briggs, *MP*, 82 f.

xvi. 31; 2 Kgs. viii. 18). Meanwhile the Phœnicians, having, like the Hebrews, conquered from earlier possessors the territory that they occupied, must have held the native population in a more or less humiliating bondage. In 1 Kgs. ix. 11, Solomon is said to have transferred twenty cities of Galilee to the king of Tyre. Add to these considerations that the Phœnicians were the only neighbors whose expansion would not injure the Hebrews, and the conclusion seems irresistible, that they were the people for whom the blessing here recorded was intended.* The teaching of this story, therefore, from the genealogical standpoint, is that Noaḥ was the father, not of the new race that peopled the earth after the Flood, but of the three related peoples whose history is the history of Palestine.† The deeper lessons are that like produces like in the moral as in the physical

* Budde (*BU*, 361 ff.) draws a further argument for the above view from the fitness of Yepheth, in the sense he gives to it, to represent the country and people whose capital was Tyre, a city famed for its beauty. See Eze. xxvii. 3 f.; etc. He also (343 ff.) answers objections, the chief of which is based on the apparent use of the term Kena'anite as a distinctive designation of the Phœnicians, especially in Num. xiii. 29; xiv. 25; Jos. v. 1; xiii. 4; Jud. iii. 3; 2 Sam. xxiv. 7; Isa. xxiii. 11; Oba. 20. In none of these passages is Kena'an or Kena'anite the proper and peculiar name of Phœnicia or the Phœnicians, but of the country — sometimes, it is true, inclusive of Phœnicia — west of the Jordan or its inhabitants. When the Phœnicians are to be distinguished from the rest, they are called Ṣidonians. See Deu. iii. 9; Jos. xiii. 4, 6; Jud. iii. 3; x. 11 f.; xviii. 7; 1 Kgs. v. 20/6; xi. 1, 5, 33; xvi. 31; 2 Kgs. xxiii. 13. See further McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 159 f.

† In *v.* 28 ff. Noaḥ is made the son of Lemekh; but this can hardly have been the idea of the original Yahwist. Perhaps, as Budde (*BU*, 405 ff.) suggests, in parts of his work omitted by the compiler he may have connected the patriarch with the Lemekh of iv. 18 ff. through Yabhal the first shepherd.

realm, and that God rewards the good and punishes the evil for their doings.

28. The paragraph in its present form closes with a statement concerning the length of the life of the hero of the Flood from the Priestly narrative. He lived **after the Flood**, which began in his six hundredth year (vii. 11) and lasted nearly two months beyond the end of it (viii. 13), **three hundred and fifty years**.

29. Thus the patriarch attained the enormous age of **nine hundred and fifty years**, an age, according to the received text, exceeded only by Yeredh (962) and Methushelaḥ (969); but, according to the more reliable reading of the Samaritans, equaled by none of his predecessors.*

The incident just discussed serves a twofold purpose, furnishing an impressive conclusion to the history of Noaḥ and arousing an interest in that of his sons. The narrative next gives an account of the distribution of their descendants, in other words of

4. The Origin of the Peoples (x.–xi.).

The larger part of these two chapters is devoted to a general survey of

a. The Race and its Divisions (x. 1–xi. 9).

On this subject there seem to have been two different views. The first was that the various peoples, each with its peculiar features, language, customs, etc., had their origin in

(1) A Gradual Dispersion (x.) along genealogical lines. This view was shared by the Priestly narrator with the second Yahwist, both of whom prepared tables show-

* For ויהי (sing.) read, with the Samaritans, וידהיו (plur.).

ing the relation of the peoples within their horizon to one another. From these tables the one preserved in this chapter was compiled.

1. It begins with a title, **Now these are the generations**, etc., from the Priestly narrative. The beginning of the Yahwistic table, as has already been explained, is found in ix. 18 f., where it serves as an introduction to Noaḥ's prophecy. Perhaps the last half of this verse, **and there were born to them sons after the Flood**, is from the same source. The Priestly narrator does not elsewhere attach statements of the sort here found to his titles. See v. 1 ; vi. 9 ; etc. : comp. Dillmann.

The sons of Noaḥ are taken in the reverse order, and the peoples that sprang from each of them enumerated. First, therefore, come

(a) *The Families of Yepheth* (*vv.* 2–5). 2. His first-born was **Gomer**, who represents the Kimmerians (Ass. *Gimirri*), an Aryan tribe who once had their home in southern Russia, giving name, as is supposed (Meyer), *GA*, i. § 452), to the Crimea. They first appeared in Asia early in the seventh century B. C., but whether they came by way of Thrace across the Bosphorus (Meyer), or through the mountains east of the Black Sea (Sayce), is disputed. The fact that they came into contact with the Assyrians some years before their attack upon the kingdom of Lydia seems to favor the latter opinion.* They were finally driven back eastward ; where they lost themselves among the Aryan hordes by whom the Assyrian empire was overthrown ; but not until they had become so

* Esarhaddon (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 128 f.) claims to have defeated them, apparently in the region of Cilicia. When they assailed Lydia, he had been succeeded by Asshurbanipal (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 172 ff.). See Meyer, *GA*, i. §§ 453 ff. ; Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 239 f., 256 f. ; Ragozin, *Assyria*, 337, 378 f.

closely associated with Cappadocia that the ancient Armenians, at least, called it Gamir. See Meyer, *GA*, i. § 486; *Dic. Bib.* art. *Gomer*. In Eze. xxxviii. Gomer furnishes a contingent for the final invasion of Palestine. But, since Gogh, the leader in this disastrous expedition, is evidently a reminiscence of the Scythian invasion (Meyer, *GA*, i. §§ 463 f.; Ragozin, *Assyria*, 423 ff.), it is probable that **Maghogh**, the second son of Yepheth, represents the Scythians, or, as the Persians called them, the Saka, who left their name in a region at the foot of the Caucasus, the Sacasene of the ancient geographers.* The Assyrians and Babylonians seem to have included them with the Kimmerians under the general term *Manda*, *nomads*. See Schrader, *KB*, ii. 128 f.; iii. 2, 98 f. The same term sometimes included the Medes, who were properly called Mada, the equivalent of the name here given to the third son of Yepheth, **Madhay**. The Assyrians first came into contact with them toward the end of the ninth century B. C., when they occupied the region about the southern end of the Caspian Sea. See Schrader, *KB*, i. 142 f., 190 f.; Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 87. They were then without a general government. In process of time they became a united nation, powerful

* The name *Gogh* is by some (Meyer) identified with that of the Lydian king Gyges (Ass. *Gugu*), but, in view of the facts in the case, there is more reason for supposing it the equivalent of *Gagu*, which occurs in an inscription of Asshurbanipal as the name of the king of Saḥi, a country to the north of Assyria. See Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 246 f.; Ragozin, *Assyria*, 422. The name *Maghogh* occurs also Eze. xxxviii. 2 and xxxix. 6; but in the latter passage, as appears from the Greek Version (B), it is a mistake for *Gogh*, and in the former, according to Meyer (*GA*, i. § 464, n.), an interpolation. Holzinger suggests that here, also, the original reading may have been *Gogh*, and that the error was occasioned by the proximity of *Madhay*.

enough, first to throw off the Assyrian yoke, and then, with the aid of the Babylonians, to overthrow the empire. See Meyer, *GA*, i. §§ 481 f.; Ragozin, *Assyria*, 419 ff.; comp. Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 287 ff. It should also be remembered in this connection, that, after the conquest of Media by Cyrus, the Hebrews, like the Greeks, often called all the subjects of the empire Medes. See Isa. xiii. 17; Jer. li. 11; etc. **Yawan** (Ass. *Yamanu*), properly the Ionians of the southwestern coast of Asia Minor and the islands adjacent, is here, as elsewhere in the Old Testament (Zch. ix. 13; Dan. viii. 21; etc.), the Greeks in general. As in Eze. xxvii. 13, where they receive earliest mention, so here, they are associated with **Tubhal** * and **Moshekh**.† Tubhal (Ass. *Tabalu*) is supposed to denote the Tibarenians, a people who, when they first appear in history (c. 850 B. C.), occupy the country adjoining Cilicia on the north (Schrader, *KB*, i. 142 f., ii. 56 f.); and Moshekh (Ass. *Mushku*), the Moschians, whose territory adjoined that of the Tibarenians on the northeast. See Meyer, *GA*, i. § 245; Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 22 f. They generally appear together, not only in the Old Testament, but in the Assyrian inscriptions. In Eze. xxxviii. 1 ff. they, like Gomer, are arrayed under the leadership of Gogh; which is only another way of saying what is here taught, that all these peoples were in some way related to one another. In the Persian period the Moschians and the Tibarenians occupied parts of the mountainous region along the southeastern shore of the Black Sea. See Frd. Delitzsch,

* The received text has תבל, without ו, but many manuscripts have the full form, תובל, as do the Samaritans.

† The text has משך, *Meshekh*, but the Samaritan reading is מושך, and this is supported by the Μόσοχ, *Mosoch*, of the Greek Version.

WLP, 250 f. The only theory with reference to **Tiras** that deserves mention is the one according to which it means the Tyrsenians, a primitive seafaring people, probably the Turushu of the Egyptian monuments (Meyer, *GA*, i. §§ 260, 263; Rawlinson, *AE*, 258, 275 ff.), who had their home on the shores and islands of the Ægean Sea; and this can hardly be regarded as satisfactory.*

3. The author follows the process of dispersion still farther, but only in two lines. Gomer is represented as the father of three tribes or peoples. Their identity is more or less uncertain. Jer. li. 27, however, seems to furnish a clue to that of the first, '**Ashkenaz**. Since, in this passage, 'Ararat is Armenia and Minni the country of the Mannai of the Assyrian inscriptions to the southeast of it (*Dic. Bib.*, art. *Minni*), it is safe to seek 'Ashkenaz in the same region. The conditions seem to be met by Ashguza, whose king supported the Mannaeans in a revolt against Esarhaddon. See Schrader, *KAT*, 610; *KB*, ii. 128 f., 146 f.; comp. Dillmann. If, however, 'Ashkenaz was northeast of Assyria, it is not probable that **Riphath** † was either in eastern (Josephus) or western (Bochart) Bithynia. The safer supposition is, that it was in the neighborhood of **Togharmah**, which Ezekiel (xxxviii. 6) locates in the remote north and tradition identifies with Armenia.‡

* According to Jub. ix. 11 the portion of Tiras was "four great islands in the midst of the sea, which approach the portion of Ham."

† For *Riphath*, 1 Chr. i. 6, evidently through an error of a copyist, has *Diphath*.

‡ The name by which the Armenians call their progenitor is Thorgom, the Thergama, or Thorgama, of the Greek Version. The latter is generally accounted an error of the translators, but an examination of the proper names of the region to which the people in question is supposed to have belonged will show that

4. The only other branch of the stock of Yepheth that receives further attention is that of Yawan. His firstborn is '**Elishah**.* The older authorities are divided with reference to this name; some making it the equivalent of Æolia (Josephus) and others of Hellas (Targum), while still others interpreted it as representing the Greeks of Sicily and Lower Italy (Targ. to Ezekiel). It has also been identified with Elis (Bochart), Carthage, the foundation of Elissa (Movers), and finally with Alashia (Conder), one of whose kings wrote several of the Tell el-Amarna letters (Schrader, *KB*, v. 1, 80 ff.; Ball, *LE*, 87 f.). The likeness in the last case is strikingly close, but this theory, whether Alashia be located in northern Syria (Maspero) or Cyprus (Winckler)† requires a reëxamination of the prevalent opinion respecting one of the next two sons of Yawan. If it was in Syria, there is still something to be said for the idea (Josephus) that **Tarshish** here means Tarsus or Cilicia; while, if it was Cyprus, a new location must be found for the **Kittites**. The former of these suppositions is rendered improbable by the apparent familiarity of the Hebrews of the sixth century B. C. with the real location of Tarshish. See Jer. x. 9; Eze. xxvii. 12. The latter seems to be forbidden by evidence that *Kittites*, if it was sometimes used in a larger sense than

there is something to be said for a contrary opinion. See Tarḥuna and Tarḥanabi, names of mountains near Lake Van (Schrader, *KB*, i. 30 f.); Tarzanabi (*KB*, i. 142 f.) and Bit-taranza (*KB*, ii. 6 f.), places in or near Media; and Tarsiḥu (*KB*, i. 182 f.), Tarḥular *KB*, ii. 18 f.), and Tarḥunazi (*KB*, ii. 62 f.), kings of Nairi, Gamgum, and Miliddu; etc.

* The Samaritan reading is אלישׁ *'Elish*.

† Maspero's view is favored by the jealousy of the Ḥittites displayed by a king of Alashia in a letter to Amen-hotep III. (Schrader, *KB*, v. 1. 82 f); Winckler's by the fact that the presents sent by the former to the latter consisted largely of copper (*KB*, v. 1. 80 ff.).

Cyprus, always included that island. See Isa. xxiii. 1, 12; also Num. xxiv. 24. These objections to the identification of 'Elishah with Alashia permit a return to one of the older theories. The only hint of the identity of the country or people in question, outside its name, is found in Eze. xxvii. 7, where the "isles" or "coasts" of 'Elishah are the source of the purple stuff from which the Tyrians made awnings for their ships. This has been supposed to point to Greece, or some part of it; but, since Tarentum was as famous in its time for the production of the purple dye from the *murex brandaris* as Laconia, it is as safe to say that the prophet had in mind the Greek colonies of Italy and Sicily as that he was thinking of the mother country. In explanation of the appearance of Tarshish and Cyprus as sons of Yawan it should be added that, although both were originally occupied by the Phœnicians (Meyer, *GA*, i. § 191), in the sixth century B. C. the Greeks had a flourishing settlement at Tartessos (Meyer, *GA*, ii. § 429), and long before that they had gained almost complete possession of the island of Cyprus (Meyer, *GA*, i. § 277). Rhodes had a similar history. Hence the **Rodhanites** * also are numbered among the sons of Yawan. The plural form of the last two names indicates in what sense the term *sons* is to be understood in this table.†

5. The line of Yawan is not followed beyond the first generation; but the author adds the general statement, that **from these** already named **the coasts of the nations**, the southern coast of Europe and the islands of

* This is the reading in 1 Chr. i. 7 as well as the Greek and Samaritan codices. The Massoretic text has דדנים, *Dodhanites*, by a copyist's error.

† It is possible, also, that it should be interpreted as indicating difference of authorship. See *v.* 13.

the Mediterranean, or the peoples occupying them, **dispersed themselves** as branches. This is undoubtedly the original meaning of the words, but, in the present text, by the omission of a clause corresponding to that by which the conclusion of a paragraph is introduced in *vv.* 20 and 31, they are made to refer to the whole family of Yepheth. The words to be supplied in this connection are **These were the sons of Yepheth.*** Thereupon follow naturally the four technical phrases in which the author presents the thought of separation from as many different points of view. Thus the peoples are represented as segregated in space **in their lands**. Each also had its distinctive **tongue**. The implication is that the various languages spoken by the branches of the family were the result of their separation. There certainly is no indication that the author thought the opposite to have been the case. Comp. xi. 1 ff. **After their families** suggests the intimate relation among the individuals of which each family was composed (viii. 19), and **in their nations** the solidarity of their interests as a division of mankind.†

(b) *The Families of Ḥam* (*vv.* 6–20). 6. Ḥam's firstborn was **Kush**. This name doubtless has more than one meaning, even in the present chapter. See *v.* 8. In most cases, however, in which it occurs in the Old Testament it plainly refers to the region, east of the Nile above the first cataract, called by the Greek geographers

* This seems a better explanation than that of Holzinger, who thinks that איש ללשנו betrays the hand of a reviser, and suggests that the one who substituted this expression for ללשנתם also substituted the clause with which the verse now begins for the one that is needed to give the remaining words their proper significance.

† On the form and order of these expressions, compare *vv.* 20 and 31.

Ethiopia. See 2 Kgs. xix. 9; Eze. xxix. 10; etc. It is therefore *a priori* probable that the same name has the same sense in this connection; a supposition that is confirmed by the following considerations: (*1*) That since the evident object of the author is to account for the origin of the peoples within his horizon, and the Ethiopians must have been one of them, he could hardly have omitted them; and (*2*) that the name is here immediately followed by **Miṣrayim**, which always elsewhere means Egypt or the Egyptians, and occurs in this sense scores of times in other extracts from the work (P) to which the passage in hand belonged.* The third branch of the Ḥamites is called **Puṭ**. This name generally (four times out of five) appears elsewhere in the Old Testament in connection with Kush. The Greek and Latin versions render it *Libya* or *Libyans*,† and this is the interpretation given to it by the other ancient, and many modern authorities, in spite of the fact that, in Nah. iii. 9,‡ the Libyans are a distinct people. If, as Ebers (*ÄBM*, 63 ff.) and others contend, Puṭ is the Punt of the Egyptian monuments, which in one instance is located east of Egypt (*ÄBM*, 65, n. 1, 107), it was probably in Arabia. See Ebers, *ÄBM*, 71; Meyer, *GA*, i. § 178, n. Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 333 ff.), although he rejects the theory that Puṭ and Punt are the same, agrees with Meyer in locating the former, with Pliny's Foda and the modern el-

* This statement of reasons is rendered necessary by the discovery of both a Kush and a Muṣr in northern Arabia, and an attempt by Cheyne and others to identify them with the Kush and Miṣrayim of this passage. See Winckler, *MVG*, 1898; *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Cush*.

† In Isa. lxvi. 19, where the original should doubtless have פוּט instead of פּוּל, *Pul*, the Greek Version has *Phoud* and the Latin *Africa*.

‡ In this instance Put is wanting in the Greek Version.

Faidh, on the west coast of Arabia. This is the direction in which one would naturally look for it, since the next name is **Kena'an**, here, as in ix. 25, Palestine and its original population. Observe, however, that in this table the Kena'anites are not represented as the brethren of the Hebrews.

7. Kush had five sons. The first of these is **Sebha.** This name is found only three times elsewhere in the Old Testament: in Isa. xliii. 3 associated with those of Kush and Miṣrayim, and in Ps. lxxii. 10 with that of Shebha. In Isa. xlv. 14 the Sabeans are described, like the Kushites in xviii. 2 and 7, as of large stature. These indications point to a people closely related to the Kushites, whose country lay between Kush and Shebha. Hence Sebha has been identified with Saba, according to Strabo (xvi. 4, 8, 10) the name of a harbor on the west coast of the Red Sea, near the site of the modern city of Massaua; or Sabae, that of a city farther northward. Comp. Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 387 ff. The **Ḥawilah** of ii. 11 was in northern Arabia, and, although it would be unsafe to take for granted that the Priestly author located his in the same region, the fact that the remaining sons of Kush must be sought in Arabia favors the opinion that the two are one. So Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 323 ff.), who locates Ḥawilah in "the district of Yemama and el-Ḳaṣim, toward the north end of the Persian Gulf, *i. e.*, strictly speaking, central and northeast Arabia." Comp. Delitzsch. **Sabhtah** is perhaps Sabata, the ancient capital of Hadramaut, in southern Arabia. Comp. Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 387. **Ra'mah,** which occurs in Eze. xxvii. 22 in connection with Shebha, is probably the place of the same name in southwestern Arabia, of which mention is made in Sabean inscriptions (Halévy), rather than the Rhegma located by Ptolemy (vi. 7, 14) on the Persian Gulf. Comp. Glaser, *SGA*,

ii. 387. **Sabhtekha** must also have been in southern Arabia, perhaps, as Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 404) suggests, as far east as Oman, but it has not thus far been satisfactorily identified. The only branch of the family of Kush carried to the third generation is that of Ra'mah, to whom are given two sons. The first bears a name, **Shebha**, familiar to readers of the Old Testament as that of the country whose queen visited Solomon (1 Kgs. x. 1 ff.), and whose principal products were gold and incense (1 Kgs. x. 2, 10; Eze. xxvii. 22, etc.) It is the country of the Sabeans, whose capital was Marib, in southwestern Arabia. In the eighth century B. C. when this people paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser III. (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 54 f.; *KAT*, 145 f.), they seem to have extended their territory, or their settlements, to the northern end of the peninsula. They played a leading part in the history of Arabia until about 300 B. C. See *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Arabia*. In *v.* 28 Shebha is a son of Yoḳṭan, while in xxv. 3 both Shebha and **Dedhan** are grandsons of Abraham. The name of this second son of Ra'mah is also familiar as that of a part of Arabia. According to Eze. xxv. 13 it extended northward as far as the border of 'Edhom. Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 395 ff.) locates it north of Medina. The name is preserved in that of Daidan, a ruined city west of Teima, the Tema with which Dedhan is associated in Isa. xxi. 14 and Jer. xxv. 23. See *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Arabia* and *Dedan*.

8. The next thing should now be a list of the sons of Sabhtekha or one of the remaining sons of Kush, or, if the author could not, or would not, go farther with the descendants of Ḥam, a conclusion like that in *v.* 5. What actually follows is a statement that, in addition to the five sons already mentioned in *v.* 6, **Kush begot Nimrodh**; a statement whose phraseology at once betrays its Yah-

wistic origin.* If, however, it is Yahwistic, the question arises, whether the name Kush here has the same meaning that it had in *v.* 7. The context supplies the answer. From *v.* 10 it is plain that the author has in mind, not Ethiopia, but, as in ii. 13, Babylonia, and that therefore the apparent relation between Nimrodh and the Kushites of *v.* 7 is an editorial creation.† The idea seems to be, that the primitive inhabitants of Babylonia were Kasshites. From them sprang Nimrodh, **the first to become a potentate**, exercising over those he ruled the authority of force, the first conqueror, **in the earth**. Nimrodh has been identified with Gilgamesh, the hero of the great epic of the Babylonians. He was a Kasshite (Jastrow, *RBA*, 480), and a mighty conqueror (Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 118 f.; Jastrow, *RBA*, 473 f.). Moreover he was a native of Marad, whose name bears a striking resemblance to Nimrodh (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 220). The prominence given to Babylon in *v.* 10, however, favors the view that he is none other than the patron deity of that city, and that his name is but a corruption of Marduk or Amaruduk (Wellhausen, *CH*, 309 f.; *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Nim-*

* The verb here used, ילד, is in the first (*Kal*) stem, as in iv. 18; and not in the third (*Hiphil*) as in v. 3, etc. The Samaritans, however, have the latter.

† This does not mean that there was no relation between the Kasshites of Babylonia and the Ethiopians. There is a growing conviction among scholars that the two peoples, widely as they finally became separated, belonged to the same stock; that, in fact, the latter were emigrants from the region of the Persian Gulf. See Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 53 ff.; Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 326 ff.; Petrie, *HE*, i. 12 ff. The question for the present, however, is not, What are the facts in the case? but, What was the author's belief and teaching with reference to it? Now it seems clear that, if this verse is by the same author as *vv.* 26–30, where the tribes of Arabia are all derived from the Shemite Yoḳtan, he can hardly have identified his Kush with the father of the Ethiopians. Comp. *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Cush*, 2.

rod); to whom the foundation of Uruk as well as Babylon seems to have been attributed. See Schrader, *KB*, vi. 38 ff. In either case the author will have reduced a mythical character to credible proportions. Comp. Ball, *LE*, 44 f.

9. The development of the latter half of *v.* 8 is interrupted by the introduction of a further description of Nimrodh as **mighty in hunting**, like many of the Assyrian kings (Ragozin, *Assyria*, 413 f.). The phrase **before Yahweh**, like *to God* in Jon. iii. 3 and Acts vii. 20, apparently denotes the highest degree of the quality in question. Comp. Keil. His prowess became proverbial, so that, even in the author's day, the Hebrews — he would hardly have put the name Yahweh into the mouth of a gentile — in praise of a successful hunter said, **Like Nimrodh mighty in hunting before Yahweh.**

10. After this digression, probably not a part of the original story, the narrative proceeds with an outline of Nimrodh's dominions. **The beginning**, nucleus, **of his kingdom** consisted of four cities, and, naturally, the territory belonging to them. These cities he had not built, but acquired in some other way, before he attempted to extend his sway over Mesopotamia. The first and most important was **Babhel**, Babylon, on the Euphrates, a city of uncertain antiquity,* which rose into prominence in the reign of Ḥammurabi (2287–2232 B. C.†) and held

* In the second story of creation (Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 40 f.; Ball, *LE*, 19) it is one of the two cities, Eridu being the other, whose creation at the beginning is expressly ascribed to Marduk. Nabonidus (555–538 B. C.) in one of his inscriptions (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 2, 84 f.) calls Sargon I. (c. 3750 B. C.) king of Babylon, and in one of the so-called omens of the latter (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 1, 102 f.) he seems to be described as the founder of the city.

† These are the dates given by Frd. Delitzsch (*GBA*, Appendix). Comp. Hommel, *AHT*, 118 ff.; also Rogers, *HBA*, i. 338.

its position in Babylonia until the death of Alexander the Great, or nearly twenty centuries. The second city was **'Orekh**,* Ass. *Uruk*, which was situated on the Euphrates below Babhel, at a site now called Warka. It was at least as old as Babylon, appearing as an important religious centre in the earliest records of southern Babylonia.† **'Akkadh**, a familiar name for northern Babylonia, is here a city, probably the one that was either built or rebuilt by Sargon I. for his residence (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 1, 102 f.; Ball, *LE*, 51 f.). Frd. Delitzsch (*WLP*, 209 ff.) identifies this Akkad or Agade ‡ with the southern half of the twin city of Sippar, on the left bank of the Euphrates above Babhel; the half sometimes designated as Sippar of Annunitum (Ishtar). See also McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 107 f. This hypothesis, however, has not met with universal favor; and the same is the case with his identification (*WLP*, 225 ff.) of **Kalneh** with Kulunu, a place mentioned by Sargon II. among his conquests. See Schrader, *KAT*, 95 f.: *Enc. Bib.*, arts. *Accad* and *Calneh*. Wherever Kalneh was, it was probably not the place mentioned under the same, or nearly the same, name in Am. vi. 2 §

* This, instead of 'Erekh, is the form required by the vocalization of the Assyrian name as well as the reading of the Greek Version.

† It also is mentioned as one of the oldest cities in the world in the second story of creation (Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 38 f.; Ball, *LE*, 19). Gilgamesh made it his capital (Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 118 f.). A temple to Ishtar was built there by Ur-gur, king of Ur, c. 2800 B. C. (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 1, 78 f.). See also McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 119 f.; Rogers, *HBA*, i. 291 f.

‡ The identity of 'Akkadh and the city whose name is usually written A-ga-de, discovered by George Smith (*AD*, 225), appears from an inscription of Nebuchrezzar I. (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 1, 170 f.) where Ishtar is called *bilit* (*alu*) *Ak-ka-di*, *patroness of the city of Akkadu*. Comp. Tiele, *BAG*, 76.

§ The note on this passage in the author's *Amos* should be corrected.

and Isa. x. 9; since the latter seems to have been in northern Syria, while the former was **in the land of Shin'ar.** In xiv. 1 this name, which some of the best authorities identify with the Shumer of the inscriptions,* appears to mean only Babylon and the country immediately about it. Here, however, as in xi. 1, Isa. xi. 11, etc., it undoubtedly includes the whole of Babylonia; for 'Akkadh was at the northern, and 'Orekh almost at the southern, end of that region.†

11. The kingdom of Nimrodh extended beyond Babylonia. **From that land he went forth** northward, along the Tigris, **to 'Asshur**, Assyria; which in Mic. v. 6 is called the land of Nimrodh. This statement is in essential agreement with the best knowledge obtainable with reference to the origin of Assyria; whose language, customs, religion, in fact its civilization as a whole, evidently came from Babylonia. See McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 209 f. The date at which migration northward began is uncertain. The first capital was Asshur, the city from which the new state took its name, on the western bank of the Tigris, midway between the upper and the lower Zab. Its history can be traced as far back as the middle of the nineteenth century B. C., when Ishmi-dagan was its ruler. See Schrader, *KB*, iii. 1, 42 f.; Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 2 f. This city the author ignores, probably because, in his time, it had lost its more ancient importance. His

* So Frd. Delitzsch (*WLP*, 198 f.), who supposes the one to have come from the other through an intermediate form *Shunger*. See also Schrader, *KAT*, 118 f.; Budde, *BU*, 385. Compare, however, Meyer, *GA*, i. 129 n.

† It is taken for granted that the phrase in question is intended to define the location of all the cities named, and not merely Kalneh, although it is admitted that the latter is a possible interpretation. See McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 132 n.

information is to the effect that the first city of Assyria **built** by Nimrodh was **Nineweh** (Ass. *Nina* or *Ninua*), which was situated on the left bank of the Tigris opposite, the site of the modern city of Mosul. It also was a city in the nineteenth century B. C., but it does not seem to have been the capital for any length of time before Sennacherib (705–681) rebuilt and fortified it. Thenceforward it remained the royal residence until the overthrow of the empire. See Schrader, *KAT*, 96 ff.* The second city built by Nimrod, **Rehobhoth-ʿir** (*Avenues-of-the-city*), has not been certainly located, but Frd. Delitzsch (*WLP*, 260 f.) identifies it with Rebit-ir, a suburb north and northeast of Nineweh, mentioned by Sargon II. (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 46 f.) and Esarhaddon (*KB*, ii. 126 f.); which, of course, must have arisen some time after the city proper. Comp. Schrader, *KAT*, 100 f. **Kalaḥ** (Ass. *Kalḫu*) was a much younger city than Nineweh, having been founded by Shalmaneser I. c. 1300 B. C. Its site is now covered by a mound called Nimrud, on the left bank of the Tigris, in the angle between that river and the Upper Zab, about twenty miles south of Nineweh. It was rebuilt by Ashurnasirpal (884–860), who made it his capital. It remained the favorite residence of the Assyrian kings until Sargon II. took possession of the new town, Dur-sharruken, which he had built for the seat of his government (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 46 ff.).

12. Finally Nimrodh built **Resen**. Its original name was probably Reshenu; but it is not probable that it was the place of that name connected with the canal built by Sennacherib (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 116 f.), for that was north

* McCurdy (*HPM*, i. 210 f.), interpreting the Nina of the inscriptions of Gudea (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 1, 26 ff.) as meaning the patroness of Nineweh, instead of Lagash, carries the history of the former back to c. 3000 B. C. Comp. Jastrow, *RBA*, 86 ff.

or east of Nineweh (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 187 f.), while the city founded by Nimrodh was **between Nineweh and Kalaḥ**, perhaps where the village of Selamieh now stands (Ménant). In the phrase just quoted Resen, Nineweh, and Kalaḥ are treated as distinct cities. The next statement unites them, with Rehobhoth-'ir, into a complex described as **the great city**. This is the Nineweh of Jon. iii. 2 f., "three days' journey" in extent. Hence the clause is probably a later addition to the story of Nimrodh, the date of which, in its present form, can hardly be earlier than 700 B. C.*

13. The story of Nimrodh being finished, the genealogy proper is continued, not, however, in the style of the Priestly narrator. The remaining names in the line of Ḥam are of Yahwistic origin. They are all introduced by the term **begot**, as if they represented individuals; but this is not the case, as appears most clearly in this

* The prevalent view is that *vv.* 8, 10–12 entire should be referred to the second Yahwist, and therefore to a date not much, if any, earlier than the beginning of the seventh century B. C. Dillman, however, dissented from this opinion, and there are signs of a disposition to reconsider the question of their authorship. Thus, Holzinger in his *Genesis* expresses himself as doubtful whether the passage should be referred to J^2 or J^1 (xxv.), admitting that Nimrodh the individual does not harmonize with the rest of the former's table (101). He might have added that, on the other hand, *v.* 8 strongly recalls the style and purpose of the first Yahwist. See iv. 20 ff.; vi. 4; ix. 20; xi. 6. To meet the objection based on the discrepancy between this story and xi. 1 ff., Dillmann simply transposes them. The treatment of the last clause of *v.* 12 as editorial removes a historical difficulty; for, although Nineweh did not eclipse the other cities mentioned until the time of Sennacherib, it had more than once been the temporary capital of the empire. Asshurnasirpal (884–860 B. C.), *e. g.*, resided there until he restored Kalaḥ. See Schrader, *KB*, i. 50 ff.; Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 46 ff.

verse and the next, where the names are all plural.* Moreover, some of them are familiar as the names of well known peoples. This is not the case with that of the first-begotten of Miṣrayim, **Ludhites**. It at once suggests the Lydians (Knobel), but the fact that it, or the corresponding singular, is almost always (four times out of five) elsewhere associated with Put,† and twice with Kush also, supports the natural inference from the present connection, that the author had in mind a people in or near Egypt, and native to that region. The theory of Ebers (*ÄBM*, 96 ff.), therefore, that the Ludhites are the Rutu or Lutu, *i. e.*, the Egyptians proper as distinguished from the types mingled with them, is to be preferred.‡ The Rutu appear first on a list of types in Egypt under the nineteenth dynasty (*ÄBM*, 93). Second on the same list are the Aamu, a Semitic tribe who pastured their herds along the eastern border of the country. These wandering herdsmen, also called An (Meyer, *GA*, i. § 43), Ebers (*ÄBM*, 98 ff.) identifies with the '**Anamites**.§ The **Lehabhites** are supposed to be the same with the Lubhites of Nah. iii. 9, *i. e.*, the Libyans (Eg. *Rebu* or *Lebu*), whose country bounded Lower Egypt on the west. Being employed as mercenaries by the Egyptians, they finally became the ruling class. Sheshonk and other kings men-

* The fiction in the term *begot* required that the names should be used without the article, but with אֵת, the sign of the definite accusative. Comp. *vv.* 16–18.

† In Isa. lxvi. 19, for פּוּל, *Pul*, read, with the Greek version, פוּט *Puṭ*.

‡ Stade (*PJ*, 5 ff.) reads לוּבִים, *Libyans*, here and in Jer. xlvi. 9, while Toy (*SBOT*) substitutes the singular of the same name for לוּד in Eze. xxvii. 10 and xxx. 5, and Cheyne (*SBOT*) omits all the names from Isa. lxvi. 19.

§ He explains the Hebrew עֲנָמִים as compounded of the two Egyptian words *an*, *nomad*, and *amu*, *herdsman*.

tioned in the Old Testament were of Libyan origin. See Meyer, *GA*, i. § 317 f.; *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Lubim*. On the list of types already twice cited they appear under the name Temḥu. See Ebers, *ÄBM*, 93. The **Naphtuhites**, according to Ebers (*ÄBM*, 112 ff.), are *those of Ptah* (*na-Ptah*), *i. e.*, the inhabitants of Memphis and the surrounding country, whose patron deity was Ptah; but Erman (*ZAW*, 1890, 118 f.) derives the name from Petemḥi, an Egyptian designation for the Delta: * and there is not much choice between the two opinions.

14. The **Pathrusites** are the people of Pathros or Upper Egypt (Eg. *Petres*), whose political and religious centre was Thebes. See Jer. xliv. 1.† The name Kasluḥet is said (*Dic. Bib.*, art. *Caphtor*) to occur in an inscription in the temple of Kom Ombo, in Upper Egypt, as that of a country conquered by Ptolemy XIII.; but there is no indication where it was situated. It is therefore of no assistance in locating the **Kasluḥites**, whom Ebers (*ÄBM*, 120 ff.) and others suppose to have occupied the coast between the Delta and Philistia. From the Kasluḥites, according to the present text, **went forth the Pelishtites**, *i. e.*, the Philistines. In Am. ix. 7, however, the Philistines are said to have come from Kaphtor. The relative clause is therefore probably a gloss that should have been inserted after **Kaphtorites**.‡ Without it this name probably meant here, as in Deu. ii. 23, the Philistines; who, since in 1 Sam. xxx. 14, Eze. xxv.

* Erman changes the text, making it read פתמחים, *Pathmuḥites*.

† In Eze. xxix. 14 and xxx. 14 Pathros seems to be a synonym for Egypt.

‡ Ball and others transfer it to this position, but there is no probability that it ever had any other place *in the text* than it now occupies. If they wished to restore it to its original position, they should have removed it to the margin.

16, and Zph. ii. 5 they are called Kerethites, are believed to have been of Cretan origin. See *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Cherethites;* comp. art. *Caphtor.*

15. In ix. 25 ff. the Kena'anite and the Phœnician were represented as brothers. Here **Kena'an** is the father of several children, **Ṣidhon** — not the ancient capital and its inhabitants alone, but, like *Ṣidonians* in 1 Kgs. xi. 5 and elsewhere, the Phœnicians as a people — being **his first-born.** His second son was **Ḥeth,** the Ḥeta of the Egyptians and the Ḥatti of the Assyrians, a powerful people with whom both of these great nations waged long and bloody wars, and to whom Sargon II. gave the decisive blow in 717 B. C. Their original seat appears to have been in Cappadocia, but they early pressed into northern Syria, whence they continually threatened Palestine. According to Gen. xxiii. 1 ff., there were Ḥittites in Hebron as early as Abraham's time. When the Hebrews returned from Egypt, there were still remnants of them in various places (Num. xiii. 29), and they did not entirely disappear after the Conquest. See 2 Sam. xi. 3 ff.; etc. It is these southern Ḥittites, as a part of the population of Palestine, who, to judge from *v.* 19, are meant in this passage. See further McCurdy, *HPM,* i. 190 ff.; Ball, *LE,* 95 ff.

16. The list of Kena'an's family, in its present form, gives him eleven sons; but the names yet to be noticed are later additions to the original table, as is shown (*1*) by their form, — they are all gentilic nouns in the singular, with the article, — and (*2*) by the fact that some of them represent communities outside the limits of the territory allotted to the Kena'anites in *v.* 19. The first of these added names is **the Yebhusite,** a collective designation for the ancient inhabitants of Jerusalem and its vicinity. See Num. xiii. 29; Jud. i. 21. **The 'Emorite,** like *the*

Kena'anite, sometimes means the original inhabitants of Palestine as a whole (xv. 16; etc.), but here, as in xiv. 7, *e. g.*, it appears to denote a tribe in the southern part of the country. See further McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 159 f. **The Girgashite**, according to Jos. xxiv. 11, lived west of the Jordan; but the tribe bearing the name cannot be more definitely located. Comp. *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Girgashite*.

17. **The Ḥiwwite** is a name given to the inhabitants of certain cities — Shekem, Gibeon, etc. — in Central Palestine. See xxxiv. 2; Jos. ix. 7, 17.* The four names thus far examined are familiar, at least three of them being found in all the editorial lists of the tribes of Palestine in the historical books of the Old Testament.† Those that follow are found only here and in the corresponding passage in Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 15 f.). **The 'Arḳite** represents the inhabitants of 'Arḳa, the ruins of which are found about twelve miles north of Tripolis. It was a very ancient city, being mentioned in

* The only passages in conflict with this statement are Gen. xxxvi. 2, Jos. xi. 3, Jud. iii. 3. In the first החוי, *the Ḥiwwite*, is evidently an error for the החרי, *the Ḥorite*, of *v.* 20. In Jos. xi. 3 the correct reading is doubtless that of the Greek Version (AB), in which *the Ḥiwwite*, as elsewhere, immediately precedes *the Yebhusite*, and it is *the Ḥittite* who is *under Hermon;* and Jud. iii. 3 should probably be made to agree therewith. See Moore *i. l.*

† The four, with the addition of *the Ḥittite*, *the Kena'anite*, and *the Perizzite*, occur Deu. vii. 1; Jos. iii. 10; xxiv. 11. All but *the Girgashite*, with the same additions, are found Ex. iii. 8, 17; xxiii. 23; xxxiii. 2; xxxiv. 11; Deu. xx. 17; Jos. ix. 1; xi. 3; xii. 8; with *the Ḥittite* and *the Kena'anite*, Ex. xiii. 5; and with *the Ḥittite* and *the Perizzite*, 1 Kgs. ix. 20; 2 Chr. viii. 7. All but *the Ḥiwwite*, with *the Ḥittite*, *the Kena'anite*, and *the Perizzite*, appear in Neh. ix. 8; and with further additions in Gen. xv. 19 ff. *The Yebhusite* and *the 'Emorite* are found in a peculiar list in Ezr. ix. 1, and *the Ḥiwwite* in another in Ex. xxiii. 28. For the order in which the names appear, see Driver, *Deu.* 97.

the Tell el-Amarna letters (Schrader, *KB*, v. 1. 170 f.), as well as in the annals of Tiglath-pileser III. (*KB*, ii. 28 f.). Later it became known as the birthplace of Alexander Severus. Sin, the Sianu of the Assyrian inscriptions (*KB*, ii. 26 f.), whence **the Sinite**, was on the coast not far from ʻArḳa.

18. **The ʾArwadhite** is the inhabitant of ʾArwadh, a city and island, now Ruad, just off the coast north of Tripolis. It is mentioned in the annals of Thothmes III. (c. 1475; Petrie, *HE*, ii. 113), and frequently by the Assyrian king Asshurnasirpal (884–860) and his successors. See Schrader, *KAT*, 104 f.; etc. Ṣemar, whence **the Ṣemarite**, is the modern Sumra. It, also, was a very old city, just north of ʻArḳa. See Petrie, *HE*, ii. 114; Schrader, *KAT*, 105; *KB*, v. 1, 98 ff. *et pas.* Finally, **the Ḥamathite** represents the people of Ḥamath, now Ḥama, on the Orontes, and the country bounding the Promised Land on the north (Num. xxxiv. 8), of which it was the capital. David added Ḥamath to his dominions (2 Sam. viii. 10), and Jeroboam II. recovered it for Israel (2 Kgs. xiv. 28). The Assyrians conquered and reconquered it, finally reducing it to lasting submission about 720 B. C. See Schrader, *KAT*, 105 f. The final clause of this verse is the proper conclusion of *v.* 15. It informs the reader that **afterward**, *i. e.*, after the birth of Ṣidhon and Ḥeth, **the families of the Kenaʻanite**, which the original author did not attempt to enumerate, **spread themselves abroad** over the territory to be described.

19. The western **border** of this territory extended from **Ṣidhon** in the north, along the Mediterranean, southward **as far as** * **Gerar**, a city the ruins of which,

* On the rendering *as far as* for באכה and עד באכה, see xiii. 10; 1 Sam. xvii. 52; 1 Kgs. xviii. 46; etc.

six miles southwest of Gaza, now bear the name Kirbet el-Jerar. See Thomson, *LB*, i. 196 ff. The place is chiefly interesting for its associations with Abraham and Isaac. See xx. 1 ff.; xxvi. 17 ff. The phrase **unto 'Azzah** (Gaza) seems to be an explanatory gloss, added because 'Azzah was better known than Gerar. The south-eastern corner of the country is **Sedhom** (Sodom) famous as the principal of the cities destroyed by the terrible visitation described in chapter xix. Its situation is disputed. Some (Dillmann) place it at, or in, the shallow southern end of the Dead Sea. This, however, is not the view that finds support in the most important passages bearing on the subject. In xix. Sedhom is repeatedly (*vv.* 17, 25, 28, 29) represented as located in *the Plain*, lit. *Round.* But this *Plain*, according to xiii., was *the Plain of the Yarden* (Jordan), *i. e.*, the oval tract on the lower course of the river at the head of the Dead Sea, seen from the hills near Bethel lying between them and Ṣo'ar (*vv.* 10 f.). Compare xix. 28, by the same author (J), where Abraham *looks toward*, but does not see, the site of the doomed cities. Still more definite is Deu. xxxiv. 3 (J), where *the Plain* is described as *the Plain of Yerecho* (Jericho). If the author of xiv., like the Chronicler (2 Chr. xx. 2), identified Ḥaṣaṣon-tamar with 'En-gedhi, he also (*vv.* 7 ff.) must have located Sedhom at the head of the Dead Sea. See Thomson, *LB*, i. 371 ff.; Tristram, *LI*, 354 f.; comp. G. A. Smith, *HGHL*, 505 f. This is probably the idea in the present passage, the author thinking of the southern border as running, first to, and then along, the sea, to the north end of it. The mention of Sedhom would naturally suggest to one familiar with chapter xiv. or Deu. xxix. 23 **'Amorah**, **'Adhmah**, and **Ṣebhoyim**; but, since one place was better than four for the author's purpose, it is probable that

these last three were added by a less thoughtful copyist.* The remaining name, **Lesha'**, seems to correspond to the 'Azzah in the preceding phrase, but it is not so easily explained, since, so far as is known, there was no place of this name in the neighborhood of Sedhom. Perhaps, as Wellhausen suggests (*CH*, 15), the name is a corruption of that of Layish, afterward Dan (Jud. xviii. 29), the place that marked the northeastern corner of the country of the Kena'anites.† The traditional view, that Lesha' is Callirrhoë, east of the Dead Sea, is certainly mistaken.‡

20. The paragraph closes, as did the first (*v.* 5), with a formal summary of its contents. Here, however, the order is not, *lands, tongues, families, nations*, but, as in *v.* 31, **families, tongues, lands, nations**.§

The collateral branches having received due attention, lastly, in harmony with the method employed throughout Genesis (xxv. 1 ff., 12 ff., 19 ff.; xxxvi. 1 ff.; xxxvii. 2 ff.),

(c) *The Families of Shem* (*vv.* 21–32), constituting the main line, are introduced. 21. The opening clause, **children were born to Shem also**, reminds one of iv. 26, and thus betrays its Yahwistic authorship. The

* Ball omits them all as secondary.

† For לשצ Wellhausen proposes to read לְשָׁה or לְשָׁם, the accusative of ליש. Holzinger's objection that, if the place meant were Layish, the name would be preceded by באכה instead of עד, like the names of Gerar and Sedhom, is not conclusive; since, in 1 Sam. xvii. 52, both particles are employed.

‡ The Samaritans read this whole verse differently, substituting a compilation from xv. 18 and Deu. xi. 24; *viz.*, *And the border of the Kena'anite was from the river of Miṣrayim to the great river, the river Perath* [Euphrates], *and to the Western Sea.*

§ For בגויהם the Samaritans read לגויהם here, as in *v.* 31.

patriarch is described first as **the father**, the progenitor, **of all the sons of 'Ebher**, *i. e.*, the Hebrews; the object of the author in so describing him being to remind his readers that he has at last reached the part of the table that has especial interest for them.* Comp. Delitzsch. At the same time he recalls the fact that Shem, though the last to appear, was **the older brother of Yepheth**,† and therefore, as in ix. 18, the eldest son of Noaḥ.

22. This interesting verse is followed by a brief extract from the Priestly table, according to which the first of Shem's sons was **'Elam**. By this name (Ass. *Elamtu*) is meant the people of the highlands about the head of the Persian Gulf, east of the river Tigris. They reached the height of their power about 2300 B. C., when they conquered Babylonia and, according to chapter xiv., extended their dominion to the Mediterranean Sea. See Meyer, *GA*, i. §§ 135 ff.; Rogers, *HBA*, i. 380 ff.; Ragozin, *Chaldea*, 219 ff. Later they came into conflict with the Assyrians, by whom they were finally (645 B. C.), reduced to subjection. See Meyer, *GA*, i. § 459; Rogers, *HBA*, ii. 269 ff.; Ragozin, *Assyria*, 399 ff. **'Asshur**, Shem's second son, can only denote the Assyrians; who, however, according to *v.* 11, were of Kushite, *i. e.*, Ḥamite origin. The discrepancy reminds the reader that he is not here dealing with the same author as he was in

* Budde (*BU*, 221) suspects that כל בני, *all the sons of*, is a harmonistic addition; but since, in this connection, *the father of 'Ebher* could only mean what is meant by the present reading, there seems to be no sufficient reason for the supposed interpolation. It is more probable that the whole of the descriptive phrase has been inserted, but not, as Bacon (*GG*, 117) suggests, from an earlier source.

† The punctuation of the original indicates that the Massoretes understood this phrase as the Greek translators rendered it: *viz.*, as meaning *the brother of Yepheth, the elder.*

that passage. '**Arpakhshadh** was early (Bochart) identified with Arapachitis (Ass. *Arbaḫa;* Schrader, *KB*, ii. 88 f.), a region on the Upper Zab, northeast of Nineweh. To this view, however, there are serious objections; *viz.*, (*1*) that it ignores important elements in the name *'Arpakhshadh;* and (*2*) that it excludes the most important branch of the stock of Shem. The latter of these considerations has led many, following Josephus (*AJ*, i. 6, 4), to prefer to believe that 'Arpakhshadh is only another name for Babylonia and the Babylonians.* The latest suggestion (Cheyne), arising from an attempt to do justice to the etymological as well as the historical side of the question, is that 'Arpakhshadh combines the names of two of the sons of Shem, *'Arpaḫ*, Arrapachitis, and *Keshedh*, Chaldea. This theory requires one to believe that an editor (Rp), having mistaken the two names for one, used the mistaken designation in *v.* 24 and substituted it for Keshedh in xi. 10 ff.: which seems improbable. See, however, *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Arphaxad;* also xxii. 22, where Keśedh † is among the sons of Naḥor, the brother of Abraham. In *v.* 13 the Ludhites were tentatively identified with the Rutu of Egypt, as the context seemed to require. The context here forbids one to suppose that the same people was in the mind of the author. In fact, **Ludh** can hardly be any other than the Lydians, who, about the beginning of the sixth century B. C., had pushed their conquests eastward to the very border of the Median empire (Meyer, *GA*, §§ 486 f.; Ragozin, *Media*, 217 ff.), and who remained one of the great powers of the period until 546 B. C., when they were

* A modification of this view makes the name a compound from a conjectural ארפּ (Ar. *'urfat*), *boundary*, and כּשׂד (Ass. *Kaldu*), Chaldea. See Schrader, *KAT*, 112 f.

† With a שׂ, like כשׂדים, *Chaldeans*.

overthrown by Cyrus. Finally, '**Aram** is the Aramæans. According to Am. ix. 7, their original home was Ḳir, which must have been somewhere in the direction of Assyria. See Am. i. 5. In xxii. 21 'Aram is the grandson of Naḥor, of Ḥaran, in northwestern Mesopotamia, a region which the Hebrews called 'Aram-naharayim (*'Aram of two rivers;* xxiv. 10) and Paddan-'aram (xxv. 20), and where the Assyrians found the Aramæans (Aramu), when they began to extend their borders westward. See Schrader, *KB*, i. 32 f. By 'Aram, however, the Hebrews usually meant what they sometimes took pains to designate as 'Aram-dammeśśekh (2 Sam. viii. 6), *i. e.*, the country of which Damascus was the capital. They also distinguished an 'Aram-beth-rehobh near Dan (2 Sam. x. 6; Jud. xviii. 28), an 'Aram-ma'akhah farther westward (1 Chr. xix. 6; 2 Sam. xx. 14), and an 'Aram-zobhah between Damascus and Ḥamath (2 Sam. x. 6). From other sources the Aramæans are known to have spread themselves far beyond these limits, mingling with other races in Assyria and Babylonia and penetrating southward into the Arabian desert, while Aramaic became the international language of Western Asia. See 2 Kgs. xviii. 26; Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 257 f.; Meyer, *GA*, i. § 401; McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 84 f.; *Enc. Bib.*, art. *Aram.*

23. There are only two of the sons of Shem in whom the Priestly author betrays any further interest. One is 'Arpakhshadh; but he, being in the line through which the Hebrews traced their descent, is neglected for the time being, to be given his place in that line in chapter xi. The other is 'Aram, to whom are given four sons. The first is '**Uṣ**,* who appears in xxii. 21 (J), not as the son, but as the uncle of 'Aram. See also xxxvi. 28 (P),

* For עוץ, the Samaritans read חוץ, *Ḥuṣ*.

where he is a grandson of Śe'ir the Ḥorite. According to Lam. iv. 21, 'Uṣ seems to include 'Edhom.* This would indicate that 'Uṣ was northwestern Arabia, where the author of the book of Job also, who makes the patriarch an Arab (i. 3) and represents him as being plundered by the Sabeans (i. 15), no doubt located it.† This being taken for granted, it is more probable that, as Glaser suggests (*SGA*, ii. 421 f.), **Ḥul** and **Gether** were in the northern and northeastern part of the same country, than that either of them was in northern Syria ;‡ especially since there is not much doubt that **Mash** § is the region, or a part of it, so called by the Assyrians, *viz.*, the great Syro-Arabian desert west of Babylonia. See Schrader, *KB*, ii. 220 f. ; vi. 1, 202 f. ; comp. Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 419 f.

24. This verse is not the continuation of the preceding. It is commonly attributed to the editor who compiled the present table (Rp) ; but, since *v.* 25 can never have immediately followed *v.* 21, and the language here used is Yahwistic,¶ it is better, with Bacon (*GG*, 117), to refer it to the author of the Yahwistic genealogy. To complete the connection with *v.* 21, supply, *And the firstborn*

* In Jer. xxv. 20 f., where 'Uṣ occurs with 'Edhom, 'Uṣ is probably interpolated. See the Greek Version.

† Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 411 ff.) inclines to think that 'Uṣ is really a synonym of Puṭ, which he takes to mean western Arabia, overlooking the fact that both names are from Priestly sections of the chapter, and therefore cannot well refer to the same region.

‡ On Frd. Delitzsch's attempt (*WLP*, 259) to identify *'Uṣ* and *Ḥul* with an Uṣṣa and a Ḥulia of the Assyrian inscriptions, see Schrader, *KB*, i. 86 f., 110 f., 146 f.

§ For מש the Samaritans read משא, as in *v.* 30; 1 Chr. i. 17, משך, *Meshekh*. See also the Greek Version.

¶ The verb ילד is here used in the first (Ḳal) stem in the sense of *beget*, as it always is in Yahwistic passages. See *v.* 26.

of Shem was 'Arpakhshadh, or something equivalent, which must have been omitted by the compiler, when *vv.* 22 f. were inserted. The name of the son of 'Arpakhshadh, **Shelaḥ**, like that of 'Enosh in iv. 26, is probably symbolical, but its significance is uncertain. This Shelaḥ begot **'Ebher**.* The name, lit. *crossing*, seems intended to embody a tradition to the effect that the original home of the Shemites of Arabia as well as Palestine was beyond the Euphrates. The corresponding gentilic, *'Ibhri*, *Hebrew*, however, is used only of Abraham and his descendants through Isaac and Jacob, and that chiefly in cases in which a contrast between them and their neighbors is expressed or implied (xiv. 13; xxxix. 14; xl. 15; xliii. 32). The tradition with reference to their origin was uniform and explicit. See xii. 5 (P); xxiv. 1 ff. (J); Jos. xxiv. 2 (E); comp. Meyer, *GA*, i. § 289.

25. The elder of the **two sons born** † to 'Ebher was **Pelegh**. The name signifies *division, separation.* To a Hebrew it would naturally suggest the dispersion from Babhel. It is not strange, therefore, to find it explained by the causal clause, **for in his days the earth**, or, strictly speaking, its population, **was separated**. See ix. 19; comp. Jub. viii. 6 ff. This clause, however, is without doubt an interpolation, since the author of the table would hardly have called attention to a story which contradicts his teaching with reference to the origin of the peoples and their languages. The second son of 'Ebher was **Yoḳṭan**. He has generally been identified with the Ḳaḥṭan of the Mohammedan genealogies; but there is really no connection between the two names,

* The Greek version introduces a Kainan (Ḳenan) between Shelaḥ and 'Ebher here as in xi. 12 f.

† For ילד, the singular, read, with the Samaritans, ילדו, the plural.

and there is no evidence that Ḳaḥṭan — originally a tribe or district in northern Yemen — was recognized by the Arabs as their eponym until they became acquainted with this table. Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 423) suggests the possibility of a connection between Yoḳṭan and Ḳaṭan, the name of several districts in Arabia.

26. This Yoḳṭan had no fewer than thirteen sons. Some of their names are very familiar; but the most of them occur only here and in the parallel passage in the Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 20 ff.), and are therefore difficult of identification. **'Almodhadh** is among those that have not been identified. For conjectures, see *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Al Modad;* Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 425. **Sheleph** is perhaps another form of Salif or Sulaf, the name of a tribe in Yemen, where similar names abound. See Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 425. **Ḥaṣarmaweth** is Hadramaut, a district on the southern coast of Arabia, east of Yemen, of which the Sabhtah (Sabata) of *v.* 7 was anciently the capital. Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 425) identifies **Yerah** with Mahrah, in eastern Hadramaut. Comp. *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Jerah.*

27. The traveler just quoted claims to have found **Hadhoram** * in Dauram, not far from Sana (*SGA*, ii. 435); and **'Uzal**,† also Eze. xxvii. 19 (Davidson), in the Azalla of the Assyrian inscriptions (Schrader, *KB*, ii. 220 f.), which he locates northeast of Medina (*SGA*, ii. 430); but in neither case is there sufficient evidence for a safe conclusion. **Diḳlah**, also, awaits identification.

28. There is a place called **'Obhal** ‡ in the Tihama, west of Yemen (Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 427), but whether there is any connection between it and the place or tribe here

* For הדורם the Samaritans read אדורם, *'Adoram.*

† For אוזל the Samaritans read איזל, *'Izal.*

‡ For עובל the Samaritans read עיבל, *'Ibhal*, while the Greek Version omits the name altogether.

meant, it is impossible to determine. **'Abhima'el** remains unidentified. **Shebha** is the Sabeans, as in *v.* 7, where, however, they are derived from Kush.

29. Thus far but two of the sons of Yoḳṭan, Ḥaṣarmaweth and Shebha, have been satisfactorily identified, but it has been taken for granted that those not definitely located should be sought somewhere in the Arabian peninsula. It is therefore natural to look for **'Ophir** in the same region. This location is favored by the appearance, in the next place, of **Ḥawilah**, which, in ii. 11, a related passage, can hardly mean anything but the Arabian desert; also by *v.* 30, from which it is clear that all the tribes or districts represented by the sons of Yoḳṭan, wherever they were, were contiguous. See *v.* 19. Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 353 ff.) is therefore probably correct in maintaining that 'Ophir is here and elsewhere in the Old Testament southeastern Arabia, along the Persian Gulf.* For other views see *Dic. Bib.*, art. *Ophir.* Finally, **Yobhabh** may well be the district called Yuhaibab or Yuhaibib in the Sabean inscriptions (Halévy), which Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 303 ff., 424) locates in the neighborhood of Mecca.

30. Here, as in *v.* 11, the author closes with a description of the extent of the territory over which the family in question spread itself. One of the limits laid down is **Mesha**, for which one would most naturally look in northern Arabia, where, as has been shown, the Mash of *v.* 23 and the Assyrian inscriptions must be

* The objection to this conclusion based on 1 Kgs. x. 22, that the region described is not remote enough, takes for granted that the author of the passage cited had 'Ophir in mind, and that he and the Yahwist located it in the same region; both of which points are open to question. Kittel thinks 1 Kgs. ix. 26 ff. and x. 22 are from different sources, and explains the omission of 'Ophir from the latter passage by supposing that the author did not know where it was situated.

located.* The other limit, **Sephar**, therefore, was probably in the southern part of the peninsula; and, if the phrase **the eastern mountain** is intended to define its position, more probably at Zafar on the coast of eastern Hadramaut, than at the place of the same name in southern Yemen. Comp. Dillmann.

31. On the formula here used, see *v.* 20.†

32. This partial summary is followed by one, also by the Priestly narrator, including **all the families of the sons of Noah**, to which is added the statement, that from these, as the larger divisions of the race, all **the nations** known to the writer **dispersed themselves after the Flood**.

The above discussion, although it has not been so fruitful as it might have been, has made possible an approximately just estimate of the value of the chapter. There can be no doubt that in the past its scientific importance has been overestimated. In the first place, as has been shown, it is not a self-consistent unit, but a compilation consisting of a table by the Priestly narrator, apparently preserved entire, which has been expanded by sometimes incongruous additions from a Yahwistic source. See the divergent representations with reference to the origin of the Babylonians and Assyrians and the tribes of the Arabian peninsula. It will also be remembered that both of the sources employed are sometimes evidently at fault in the relations in which they place the peoples enumerated. Thus, *e. g.*, Miṣrayim (Egypt) and Kena'an are alike sons of Kush (P), Ṣidhon and Ḥeth sons of Ke-

* Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 420 f.) identifies Mesha, not with Mash, but with the Massa of xxv. 14; but if, as is generally agreed, *v.* 23 and xxv. 12–17 are by the same author (P), this is inadmissible.

† For לגויהם read בגויהם, as in *vv.* 5, 20, 32.

na'an (J), and 'Asshur and 'Elam sons of Shem (P); although in each case the peoples meant belonged to distinct types and spoke altogether different languages. Finally, although *vv.* 5 and 32 permit one to suppose that the author was acquainted with more peoples than he enumerated, there is no evidence that those not named included either black, brown, or yellow men, or any whites beyond the limits within which those named must be located. In other words, the table covers only that part of the earth whose northern limit is the Black Sea, its eastern the Caspian, and its southern the strait of Bab el-Mandeb, while its western is Tarshish just outside the dimly known Mediterranean. It is plain that a document so imperfect cannot be regarded as authoritative on the subject of the origin of the peoples into which the race is divided. Still, it is not lightly to be pronounced worthless. It doubtless contains material of interest and importance to the ethnologist. In any case the religious ideas underlying it must elicit the admiration of the thoughtful reader; for it teaches (*1*) that the race is one, and (*2*) that the rise of the nations and languages was a part of the divine plan (i. 28), that man should subdue the earth, and govern and enjoy it. See Ragozin, *Chaldea*, 131 ff.

The two authors from whose narratives the Table of Nations was mostly compiled agree in teaching that the diversity in language, etc., among mankind is the result of dispersion to the various quarters of the earth. This was not the only view of the matter current among the Hebrews. A more primitive is taught in the story of

(2) The Confusion of Tongues (xi. 1–9). 1. It begins with the declaration that at first **the whole earth**, or all the people on it, were of **one language**, lit. *lip*, and

they all had **the same words**; there had thus far not arisen even dialectic variations among them.

2. At this time the whole body of primitive men **moved eastward**. The author does not mention the point of departure. The natural inference from the preceding context would be that it was 'Ararat, or its vicinity; and this view is common (Delitzsch). The author, however, can have had no such thought; for **the land of Shin'ar**, Babylonia, was not eastward, but directly southward, from the region where the ark grounded. The text evidently requires that the place from which the movement started be sought to the west of Babylonia, *i. e.*, in Arabia, where the author of ii. 8 seems to have located 'Edhen: which means that, when this passage was written, the Yahwistic narrative did not contain an account of the Flood. When the wanderers came to Shin'ar, delighted with the beauty and fertility of the country, **they abode** there, the first of several layers of immigrants from the same direction. See Meyer, *GA*, i. § 131 f.; Rogers, *HBA*, i. 353 f.

3. Having decided to wander no more, they proceeded to build themselves houses. To this end, since neither stone nor wood in any quantity was within their reach, they resolved to use **bricks**. The Babylonians of later times employed the same material. Their bricks were of two kinds, sun-dried and kiln-burned. The former were used for cheap buildings, and for the interiors of more ambitious structures. See Ragozin, *Chaldea*, 39 f. If it was desired that a structure be particularly substantial and enduring, the builder would naturally, like those of this story, need burned bricks, and wish to **burn them thoroughly**. The bricks thus provided were laid, not in mortar, but in a stronger cement, the **bitumen** to this day supplied by the wells at Hit on the Euphrates above

Babylon. See Ragozin, *Chaldea*, 42 ff.; Rogers, *HBA*, i. 287 f.

4. Encouraged by their success in securing proper materials, mankind began to plan larger things. They aspired to build **a city.** Now a city, on the supposition that the present passage refers to a later date than iv. 17, was not an unheard-of enterprise. This, however, was to be a much larger city than that of Ḥanokh. Moreover, it was to have **a tower** so high that **its top** would seem lost **in heaven**. Towers of this sort, called *zikkurats*, were common in Babylonia. Many of them had names indicating their great height. Thus, one at Lagash was called "the summit house," * one at Agade "the house reaching to heaven" † one at Larsa "the link of heaven and earth," ‡ etc. See Jastrow, *RBA*, 616 ff., 639. They were symbolic structures, representing the mountain on which the gods were supposed to dwell (Jastrow, *RBA*, 612 ff.; also Eze. xxviii. 14); and those who erected them sought by so doing to obtain the favor of the divinities to whom they were dedicated (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 2, 6 f. §). At the same time they gratified human pride. A Hebrew would naturally regard all such works as products of a lust for glory. Hence the author of this story represents the builders of the zikkurat whose erection he is describing as impelled by the desire to make themselves

* *E-pa.* † *E-an-dadia.* ‡ *E-dur-an-ki.*

§ Nabopolassar concludes his account of the reconstruction of the zikkurat of the temple of Marduk in Babylon as follows: "Marduk, my lord, look graciously upon my pious deeds. By thy lofty command, which may not be changed, may the work, the product of my hands, endure forever. As the wall of E-temen-an-ki [the name of the tower] is fixed forever, so establish my throne firm to the remotest time. E-temen-an-ki, to the king who restored thee be gracious. When Marduk, amid rejoicing, enters thee, O house, proclaim to Marduk my lord my piety."

a name. This explains the tower. The motive they give for the enterprise as a whole is, **lest we be scattered over the face of the whole earth.***

5. When the plan proposed had been adopted and partially executed, Yahweh, the same who brought the animals to 'Adham to see what he would call them (ii. 19), and called to him in the garden to know where he was (iii. 9), **came down to see the city**, but especially **the tower,† that the sons of men had built**, or, more exactly, had brought to an advanced stage of construction. See *v.* 8.

6. He was not pleased with the enterprise. He saw at once whence came the impulse to it. They were **one people**, and they had the consciousness of strength that must sooner or later come to a united multitude. He saw, too, that this was **their first ‡ exploit**, only the beginning of the things that they would undertake, unless something was done to check their presumption. **Nothing that they plan § to do**, he says, **will be too hard for them.**

7. These words seem to have been addressed to the angels by Yahweh on his return to his palace above the clouds (Am. ix. 6). He now takes the attendant spirits into his plan for frustrating the ambition of mankind.

* The construction in this verse is undoubtedly somewhat confusing, but the naturalness of the tower in the plan of a Babylonian city makes the theory that the text is here composite decidedly improbable. The analysis proposed by Gunkel, who makes the lust for fame the motive for building the city, and the dread of separation that for erecting the tower, is certainly mistaken.

† Ball omits וְאֵת הַמִּגְדָּל.

‡ For הֵחֵלּם Ball, following the Greek Version, reads הֵחֵלּוּ.

§ On יִזְמוּ, for יָזְמוּ, and, in *v.* 7, נָבְלָה, for נָבְלֹה, see Ges. § 67, R 11.

Come, he says, **let us go down**,* **and there confound their language**. The explanatory clause, **so that they will not understand one another's language**, must not be taken too literally, since such a decree would have abolished the family, and rendered the continuance of the race impossible. It should also be remembered that, although, according to x. 25, the dispersion occurred in the fourth generation after the Flood, the present writer, since he betrays no knowledge of any such catastrophe, must have thought of mankind as much more numerous when they were scattered than the author of that passage could have conceived them. See vi. 1.

8. The means proposed was adopted, — for a statement to that effect, see *v.* 9, — and produced the desired result. Thereby Yahweh **scattered** mankind **thence over the face of the whole earth**, and, in consequence, **they ceased**, no longer continued, **to build the city**.† See *v.* 5.

9. The city thus left unfinished — whether it ever had any other name, the author omits to say — was thenceforth called **Babhel**, Babylon, **because there Yahweh confounded the language of the whole earth**. The idea of the author seems to be, that the name *Babhel* was derived from the verb rendered *confound*;‡ but, since *Babhel* is only another form of the Babylonian compound *Bab-ilu*, meaning "the gate of the god," it is probable that, on the contrary, the story here narrated was suggested by the similarity between the two vocables. The re-

* The transfer of the scene from earth to heaven, it must be admitted, is unexpected, but it hardly seems to warrant the conclusion that this verse is by a different author from *v.* 5. Comp. Gunkel.

† The Samaritans add ואת המגדל, *and the tower*. See also the Greek Version.

‡ בלל, *balal*.

maining materials for it were doubtless gathered from current reports concerning a ruined tower of immemorial antiquity located in Babylon. The fact that the author makes the tower a part of the city is overlooked by those (Delitzsch) who, following Jewish tradition (*Ber. Rab.*, 172), identify it with the zikkurat of the temple of Nebo at Borsippa, now Birs Nimrud, on the west bank of the Euphrates not far from the capital, finding support for their view in the fact that this tower stood a long time unfinished, and finally fell into ruins, before Nebuchadrezzar restored it.* A safer view is that it was the equally famous zikkurat of the temple of Marduk, the tutelar divinity of Babylon, which, after it had long been in ruins, Nabopolassar (625–604) rebuilt (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 2, 2 ff.) and Nebuchadrezzar completed (*KB*, iii. 2, 30 f., 40 f.). According to a tablet discovered by George Smith (*The Athenæum*, Feb. 12, 1876), it was built in stages, with the sides facing the cardinal points ; the first stage being 300 ft. square and 110 ft. high, the second 260 square and 60 high, the third 200 square and 20 high, the fourth 170 square and 20 high, the fifth 140 square and 20 high, the sixth 110 (?) square and 20 high, while the seventh was the sanctuary 80 by 70 ft. in area and 50 ft. high ; the entire height being equal to the length of each side of the base, 300 feet. It was called E-temen-an-ki, "The house of the foundation of heaven and earth." This is the tower

* The great king describes (Schrader, *KB*, iii. 2, 52 ff.) the condition of the structure before its restoration as follows : "At that time E-ur-imin-an-ki [the house of the seven divisions of heaven and earth], the zikkurat of Barsip, which a former king had built, raising it to the height of forty-two cubits, but not rearing its top, had from a remote date been in ruins. Its gutters had not been kept in order ; rains and storms had torn down its walls ; the tiles of its facing had burst asunder ; the bricks of its sanctuary had fallen in heaps."

which, in its ruined condition, is here used to illustrate the wantonness and the futility of godless ambition.*

In the Priestly narrative the table of the nations was followed immediately by a genealogy, resembling that of chapter v., of

b. The Line of Shem (xi. 10–26).

This time, however, the totals are omitted, also the formal statement in each case, that the given patriarch died.†

10. Shem was **a hundred years old** before he had any children, older than, according to the correct text, were any of the antediluvian patriarchs except 'Adham, Sheth, and Noaḥ. The reason for the postponement of paternity in his case was the same as in that of Noaḥ, the necessarily limited capacity of the ark. When the Flood was over, the restriction upon the increase of the family that survived was removed and **'Arpakhshadh** was born. That, since Shem was born after Noaḥ was five hundred years of age, would be in Noaḥ's six hundred and first year, which was the second year of the Flood (viii. 13 f.), or, as the Hebrews expressed it, **two years after the Flood.**‡ See ix. 28 f.; comp. Holzinger. This interpretation makes the present passage consistent with itself,

* The above discussion has made it clear that the story of the tower of Babhel, in the form in which it has been preserved in the Old Testament, is of Hebrew origin. Whether there was an indigenous legend on the subject, is, for the present, uncertain. The one reported by Eusebius (*PE*, ix. 14) as derived from Berosus is but another form of the Hebrew story.

† The Samaritans have both items, the Greek Version only the latter.

‡ If, as Budde (*BU*, 108 f.) maintains, the last clause is a gloss, the above is simply the glossator's interpretation of the original author's statement.

but renders only more apparent the discrepancy between it and x. 22, where 'Arpakhshadh is not the first, but the third, son of his father. The new difficulty seems best met by supposing, with Delitzsch, that, in chapter x., the order is determined by the distribution of the peoples which the sons of Shem there represent. Comp. Gunkel.

11. Shem did not attain the age of any of the antediluvian patriarchs except Ḥanokh; yet he lived, after the birth of 'Arpakhshadh, **five hundred years**, so that his total was six hundred.

12. In chapter x. 'Arpakhshadh was one of a number of peoples; here the name is treated as if it denoted an individual. He was but **thirty-five years** old when his first son was born. This is an early age as compared with that of Shem, but, when compared with that at which Lemekh and those before him began to beget children, it is none too early to harmonize with the author's theory of a gradual decrease, not only in the length of human life, but in the period preceding paternity.* On the name **Shelaḥ**,† see the comment to x. 22.

* This fact seems to prove that the Massoretic reading, and not that of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Greek Version, *a hundred and thirty-five*, is the original. The same must be said in the cases of the next five patriarchs, in each of which there is a difference between the Hebrew and the other texts of just a hundred years, and in that of the sixth, where the difference amounts to only fifty years. The object in raising the age of paternity doubtless was to lengthen the period between the Flood and the birth of 'Abhram, and thus relieve the reader from the necessity of believing that none of the preceding nine patriarchs died until forty-eight years after this last was born.

† Here, also, the Greek Version introduces Kainan between 'Arpakhshadh and Shelaḥ, and Dillmann favors this reading. See also Lu. iii. 36. The fact that the number of years assigned, and the length of the periods into which they are divided, are the same as in the case of Shelaḥ, however, sustains the opinion already ex-

13. The second period of 'Arpakhshadh's life was long, **four hundred and three years**, in comparison with the first; yet the total fell considerably short of that of his father.*

14. Shelaḥ had lived only **thirty years** when **'Ebher** was born. On the name and its significance, see the comment to x. 24.

15. The sum of Shelaḥ's years was thirty *plus* **four hundred and three**,† or four hundred and thirty-three.

16. In the case of 'Ebher the age of paternity is raised to **thirty-four** without any apparent reason.‡ On **Pelegh** his son, see the comment to x. 25.

17. The second period of 'Ebher's life, according to the received text, was **four hundred and thirty years**; but, since the addition of this number would raise his total above that of his father or grandfather, and there is no other instance of this sort in the table, it is probable that the Samaritans are correct in making the total four hundred and four, and that, therefore, 'Ebher should be

pressed, that the patriarch is an importation. His name seems to have been added to make the number in the table ten without that of either Noaḥ or 'Abhram.

* In the Samaritan text the hundred or fifty added to the first period is deducted from the second, so that the totals remain unchanged. Not so in the Greek Version. In this case for *four hundred and three* the latter has *four hundred and thirty*, making the total five hundred and sixty-five.

† For the *three hundred and three* which one would expect in this case the Greek Version has *three hundred and thirty*, making a total of four hundred and sixty.

‡ In *vv.* 12 and 14 the subject precedes the verb. The order is now reversed, and the new construction is used for the rest of the table. The change does not favor Budde's suggestion (*BU*, 413 f.), that the names 'Arpakhshadh and Shelaḥ were added to the genealogy by the Priestly narrator. It would rather point to Rp as the supplementer. See, however, the comment to x. 24.

represented as living, after the birth of his first son, three hundred and seventy years.*

18. The firstborn of Pelegh was **Re'u**. The name reminds one of Ruua, the designation for an Aramæan tribe of southern Babylonia frequently mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions (Frd. Delitzsch, *WLP*, 237 ff.; Schrader, *KB*, ii. 10 f., etc.); but it is doubtful if Glaser (*SGA*, ii. 408) is correct in identifying them.

19. In x. 25 Pelegh is connected with the dispersion. If the author here had such a connection in mind, it may explain the abrupt abridgment, with him, of human life by nearly two hundred years. At any rate, he lived after the birth of Re'u only **two hundred and nine† years**, so that his total was only two hundred and thirty-nine.

20. **Serugh**, the firstborn of Re'u, is commonly identified with Sarug, a district a day's journey north of Ḥaran. Comp. Glaser, *SGA*, ii. 408.

22. The name **Naḥor**, which Serugh gave his eldest son, is a familiar one. Elsewhere in the Old Testament, however, except in the parallel passage in Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 26), Naḥor is the brother of 'Abhram (*v.* 26) and the father of the Aramæans (xxii. 20 ff.). It is probable that this name was added at the same time with 'Arpakhshadh and Shelaḥ, when the number was increased from seven to ten. Comp. Budde, *BU*, 413 f.

24. Of all the patriarchs Naḥor was youngest, only

* This is the actual reading of the Greek Version, according to which, therefore, 'Ebher lived in all *five hundred and four years*.

† The transfer of a hundred years from the second to the first period by the Samaritans makes it appear that Re'u and the three following patriarchs lived considerably longer before than after they began to have children.

twenty-nine,* when his first son was born. The theories with reference to the origin of the name of his son **Terah** are various, the latest being that of Jensen (*HA*, 153), who identifies it with that of a Hittite god, Tarḥu.

25. Here again the second period is unusually shortened, being but **a hundred and nineteen years**, so that Naḥor lived in all only a hundred and forty-eight.†

26. This list, like that of chapter v., ends with a father who has three sons. Here, too, as in the preceding case, the author gives the age, **seventy years**, of the father when the first son was born. The three sons of Teraḥ were **'Abhram, Nahor, and Haran**.

The reasons given for doubting the historicity of the table in chapter v., with a single exception (*3*), apply to this one. Moreover, by reducing the age of paternity, without correspondingly reducing the total of years, the author exposed himself to an objection quite as serious as the one he avoided. It is also incredible that all the persons — taking for granted that the names represent persons — here mentioned, including 'Abhram, were born forty-eight years before any of them died; that three of the others outlived 'Abhram; and that 'Ebher survived

* For *twenty-nine* the Samaritans read *seventy-nine*, the increase of only fifty being necessary to make the death of Naḥor fall in the year before the birth of 'Abhram, and the death of Teraḥ in the year in which 'Abhram left Ḥaran (xii. 4). See Acts vii. 4. The Greek Version agrees with the Samaritan text so far as the reading *seventy-nine* is concerned, but in this case the number added has no significance. To produce the result obtained by the Samaritans the Greek translators would have had to add sixty to the age of Teraḥ at the birth of 'Abhram as well as to the total of the years of Naḥor.

† For *a hundred and nineteen* the Greek Version has *a hundred and twenty-nine*, making a total of two hundred and eight.

seven years after Joseph had been sold into Egypt. The modifications in the Samaritan text and the Greek Version relieve this difficulty, but, as has been shown, create the one that the original author avoided.*

* The following tables exhibit all the data used in the above discussion and the results deduced from them. The first is a comparative view of the figures representing the two periods of the life of each of the patriarchs, according to the three authorities cited, and their totals; the variants from the Massoretic text being in heavy type.

	Firstborn			Remainder			Total		
	H	S	G	H	S	G	H	S	G
Shem	100	100	100	500	500	500	600	600	600
'Arpakhshadh	35	**135**	**135**	403	**303**	**430**	438	438	**565**
Ḳenan	..	..	**130**	..	..	**330**	..	..	**460**
Shelaḥ	30	**130**	**130**	403	**303**	**330**	433	433	**460**
'Ebher	34	**134**	**134**	370	**270**	370	404	404	**504**
Pelegh	30	**130**	**130**	209	**109**	209	239	239	**339**
Re'u	32	**132**	**132**	207	**107**	207	239	239	**339**
Serugh	30	**130**	**130**	200	**100**	200	230	230	**330**
Naḥor	29	**79**	**79**	119	**69**	**129**	148	148	**208**
Teraḥ	70	70	70	135	**75**	135	145	145	**205**

The second shows in what year after the first of the Flood each of the patriarchs, including Noaḥ and 'Abhram, was born, and in what year he died.

	Birth-date			Death-date		
	H	S	G	H	S	G
Noaḥ	..	..	..	350	350	350
Shem	..	..	..	501	501	501
'Arpakhshadh	1	1	1	439	439	**566**
Ḳenan	..	..	**136**	..	..	**596**
Shelah	36	**136**	**266**	469	**569**	**726**
'Ebher	66	**266**	**396**	470	**670**	**900**
Pelegh	100	**400**	**530**	339	**639**	**869**
Re'u	130	**530**	**660**	369	**769**	**999**
Serugh	162	**662**	**792**	392	**882**	**1122**
Naḥor	192	**792**	**922**	340	**940**	**1130**
Teraḥ	221	**871**	**1001**	366	**1016**	**1206**
'Abhram	291	**941**	**1071**	466	**1116**	**1246**

The first general division of the book of Genesis closes with a third genealogy, that of

c. The Family of Teraḥ (*vv.* 27–32).

27. The title is followed by a repetition of the names of the sons of Teraḥ. The first is '**Abhram**. He is also called 'Abhraham. The latter name is probably a local or dialectical variation upon the former. The Priestly narrator, in xviii. 5, interprets it as a pledge given to the patriarch that he would be "the father of a multitude of nations."* **Naḥor**, according to this author the second of his name, at once drops as completely out of sight as his grandfather, not being mentioned even in the notice of the migration from 'Ur to Ḥaran (*v.* 31). The reason for thus dismissing him is not far to seek. The author having, in x. 22, made 'Aram a brother of 'Arpakhshadh, could not let Naḥor remove to Ḥaran and so become, what the Yahwist (xxii. 21) says he was, the progenitor of the Aramæans. The suggestion has been made (Wellhausen), that **Haran** is only another form of Ḥaran; but this would imply the idea that Haran was the father of the Aramæans, an idea that the author could certainly not have entertained. The only son of Haran was **Loṭ**, who finally accompanied his uncle 'Abhram to Kena'an (xiii. 12).†

28. This is all that the Priestly narrator has to say of Haran. The Yahwist, from whose work *vv.* 28–30 were

* The original meaning of the name is doubtful; but the favorite theory is that it is another form of 'Abhiram, *my father is exalted* (Num. xvi. 1 ff.), as 'Abhner is of 'Abhiner (1 Sam. xiv. 50). On a corresponding Assyrian name, Aburamu, see Schrader, *KAT*, 200, 479.

† Note that P, with his customary regard for the reputation of his worthies, seems to have omitted the obscene legend by which J accounts for the Moabites and the Ammonites. See xix. 29.

taken, says that he **died before**, in the presence of, and therefore in advance of, **Teraḥ his father in the land of his birth**. If no name were given to this land, one would naturally identify it with Mesopotamia; for this is called the land of 'Abhram's birth (xxiv. 7), and Ḥaran the city of Naḥor (xxiv. 10). It is therefore a surprise to find that, according to the text, the land in question was **'Ur of the Kaldeans**. In fact this explanatory phrase sounds so strange in this connection that many authorities regard it as an interpolation for the purpose of harmonizing the Yahwistic with the Priestly narrative. See also xv. 7; comp. Delitzsch.

29. The natural inference from the order in which the sons of Teraḥ are mentioned is that Haran was the youngest. Yet he seems to have married, and his offspring to have become adult, before his brothers **took themselves wives**; for Naḥor married his daughter. 'Abhram chose **Śaray**, who, according to xx. 12 (E), was his half-sister. She is later called Śarah, her name, according to xvii. 15 (P), having been changed at the same time with that of her husband. **The name of the wife of Naḥor was Milkah**. See xxii. 20 ff. Milkah had a sister, **Yiskah**; but she plays no part in the story.

30. In process of time 'Abhram discovered that **Śaray was barren**, a circumstance that furnishes a background for much of the subsequent history of the patriarch.*

31. The rest of the chapter is of Priestly origin, the continuation and conclusion of *v.* 27. The reason for the migration of Teraḥ and his family, with the exception of Naḥor,† is not given. Tradition seems to teach

* For ולד the Samaritans read יֻלַּד.

† The Samaritans, feeling this omission, have clumsily supplied it as follows: *and Śaray and Milkah his daughters-in-law, the wife of 'Abhram and Naḥor his sons.*

that he left his home to escape idolatrous associations. See Jub. xii. If, however, he originally **went forth** * **from 'Ur of the Kaldeans**, it is probable that the change of residence was occasioned by political considerations, perhaps an invasion of the 'Elamites. See Meyer, *GA*, i. §§ 135 ff.; Rogers, *HBA*, i. 379 ff. 'Ur is no doubt the Uru of the Assyrian inscriptions, one of the most ancient and famous of the cities of Babylonia; its history as a religious as well as commercial centre going back nearly four thousand years before the Christian era. Its ruins have been unearthed at Mugheir near the right bank of the Euphrates a little below the site of 'Orekh. See Schrader, *KAT*, 129 ff.; Rogers, *HBA*, i. 370 ff.; McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 117 f.; comp. Kittel, *HH*, i. 181 ff. The destination of the emigrants was **the land of Kena'an**; but when they reached **Ḥaran**, now Ḥarran, on the Belias (Belik), a tributary of the upper Euphrates, for some reason, perhaps the feebleness of Teraḥ, they stopped there. Ḥaran is first mentioned in the Assyrian records by Tiglath-pileser I. (c. 1100); but it was much older than his time, and it remained an important religious and commercial centre long after the overthrow of the Assyrian empire. See Schrader, *KB*, i. 38 f.; iii. 2, 96 ff.; Eze. xxvii. 23; McCurdy, *HPM*, i. 84 f. It, like 'Ur, was a seat of the worship of Sin (the moon), a fact that indicates a close relation between the two cities and doubtless explains the route taken by Teraḥ and his family.

* In the Massoretic text the verb is plural and is followed by אתם. This is an impossible combination, which must be remedied by reading ארו, *with him*, for אתם, *with them* (Ball); or, better, by changing ויצאו to ויצא, *and he went forth*, with the Syriac Version, as above, or ויצאו אתם to ויוצא אתם, *and he brought them forth*, with the Samaritans and the Greek Version.

32. The Massoretic text gives to Teraḥ a total of **two hundred and five years**. So also the Greek Version. The Samaritans, however, make the number a hundred and forty-five, and this is probably the correct reading. The reasons for this conclusion are the following: (*1*) There is no other case in this chapter in which the son lives longer than the father. (*2*) In all other cases the totals are the same in the Massoretic as in the Samaritan text. (*3*) It is hardly probable that any one so careful as the present writer would adopt figures that would make 'Abhram appear to have left his father sixty years alone in Ḥaran. Substitute the Samaritan for the present reading and the year of Teraḥ's death becomes the seventy-fifth of 'Abhram, the year in which, in obedience to the call of God (xii. 4), the latter continued his journey to Kena'an. See also Acts vii. 4.

APPENDIX

The Babylonian Account of the Deluge; from Tablet XI. of the Gilgamesh Epic *

Said Ut-napishtim to Gilgamesh:
"I will reveal to thee, Gilgamesh, a precious matter;
And the decree of the gods I will relate to thee.
Shurippak, a city known to thee,
Lying on the bank of the Euphrates, —
When that city had become old, the gods in its midst,
The great gods, were moved in their hearts to cause a flood.
Therein were their father, Anu,
Their counsellor, the warrior Bel,
Their herald, Ninib,
Their leader, Ennugi.
The all-wise Ea sat with them, and
Their words he repeated to a hurdle:
'Hurdle, hurdle! wall, wall!
Hurdle hear, and wall attend!
Man of Shuruppak, son of Ubar-tutu,
Plan a structure, build a ship;
Leave riches, look after lives;
Goods hate, life preserve.
Living things of all kinds embark in the ship.
The ship that thou shalt build —
Its size shall be measured;
Its width and its length shall correspond;
Into the deep launch (?) it.'

* For the original transliterated, see Schrader, *KB*, vi. 1, 230 ff. The lines are here numbered as in that work.

I understand and speak to Ea, my lord,
'. . . my lord, which thou speakest thus,
I will respect, I will perform.
[But what] shall I answer the city, the people, and the elders'?
Ea openeth his mouth and speaketh;
He saith to me his servant,
'Man, thus shalt thou speak to them:
Bel hath cast me off, he hateth me; therefore
I will not dwell in your city,
Nor will I lay on the soil of Bel my head; but
I will go down to the deep, with Ea, my lord, will I dwell.
Upon you will he pour overwhelming rain.
. . . birds, . . . fishes,
. . . . . the harvest,
A time hath Shamash set, he who illumineth the darkness;
At evening shall he cause heaven to pour upon you heavy rain.'

"As soon as morning brightened
. . . . . .*
The strong . . . . . brought.
On the fifth day I drew its plan.
In *KANḪISA* 120 cubits arose its walls;
Likewise 120 cubits was the extent of its top.
I drew a picture of its front, outlined it.
Urtaggip it to the number of six;
I divided . . . . . into seven parts;
The inside of it I divided into nine parts.
Plugs against water I drove within it.
I provided a rudder, and laid in necessaries.
Six sars of bitumen I poured on the outside (?);
Three sars I put on the inside.
Three sars of oil the people who bore its *sussul* † brought;

* Seven lines missing.

† Something made of wood (*isu*).

I left a sar of oil, which the sacrifices consumed;
Two sars of oil the seaman stowed away.
For the people I slaughtered oxen;
I killed lambs daily.
Sirishu, mead, oil and wine
I gave the people to drink like the water of the river;
A feast I made like the day of the new year;
I opened a jar of unguent, thrust my hand into it.
In the month of great Shamash the ship was finished.
Because . . . . . is toilsome
The *gir* of the ship of (?) *KAK MESH* above and below is full (?).
. . . . . two-thirds thereof.

"All that I had I stowed therein:
All the silver I had I stowed therein;
All the gold I had I stowed therein;
All the living things I had I stowed therein.
I embarked in the ship all my family and my kindred:
Cattle of the field, beasts of the field, the artisans, all of them, I embarked.
'A time hath Shamash set, and
He who illumineth the darkness at evening shall cause heaven to pour out heavy rain.
Go into the ship and close the door.'
That time arrived.
He who illumineth the darkness caused heaven to pour out heavy rain.
When I beheld the face of day,
To look upon the day I was afraid.
I went into the ship and closed my door;
To the pilot of the ship, the seaman Puzur-bel,
I delivered the structure with its contents.

"As soon as morning brighteneth
There riseth from the horizon a dark cloud.
Ramman in the midst of it roareth;

Nabu and Marduk go before,
As heralds they go over mountain and plain.
Uragal looseth the *tarkulli;*
Ninib goeth forth, beginneth the conflict;
The Anunaki bear torches
With whose brightness they make the land glow;
Ramman's fury reacheth to heaven,
Turneth every bright thing to darkness.
. . . the land like . . . devastated.
One day the storm . . . . . .
Swiftly it blew and the water . . . mountains . . .
Like a battle upon men . . . . . .
One seeth not another;
Men are not recognized in heaven.
The gods fear the flood;
They flee, they climb to the heaven of Anu.
The gods, like a pet dog, cower in *kamati.*
Ishtar crieth like a woman in travail;
The mistress of the gods, the sweet-voiced, mourneth:
'May that day turn to clay,
Because I in the assembly of the gods spoke evil,
When I spoke evil in the assembly of the gods,
To destroy my men a conflict decreed, —
Do I then bear my men,
That, as the brood of fishes, they may fill the sea'?
The gods of the Anunaki weep with her;
The gods, prostrated, sit weeping;
Their lips are covered . . . *a bu aḫ re e ti.*

"Six days and nights
The wind bloweth, the flood, the storm, overwhelmeth the land.
When the seventh day arriveth, the storm, the flood, abateth; the conflict,
Which it fought like an army.
The sea rested, retreated, and the tempest, the flood, ceased.

When I behold day, the noise is stilled,
But all mankind are turned to clay.
When daylight came, I prayed;
I opened the window, the light fell upon the side of my face.
I am crushed, and I seat myself and weep:
Over the side of my face flow my tears.
I looked upon the world, wide-spread was the sea.
Twelve leagues distant an island rose:
For Mt. Nisir the ship made.
Mt. Nisir held the ship fast, and did not let it rise:
One day, a second day, Mt. Nisir, KI MIN;
A third day, a fourth day, Mt. Nisir, etc.;
A fifth, a sixth, Mt. Nisir, etc.
When the seventh day arrived,
I brought forth and released a dove;
The dove went, it returned;
There was no resting-place, therefore it came back.
I brought forth and released a swallow:
The swallow went, it returned;
There was no resting-place, therefore it came back.
I brought forth and released a raven;
The raven went, and, when it saw that the water was drying up,
It ate, *ishaḫḫi, itarri*, but it did not come back.
I sent forth to the four winds; I offered an offering.
I placed an altar on the top of the mountain;
By sevens vessels I set:
Into them I poured cane, cedar, and *asu*,
The gods smelled the odor;
The gods smelled the pleasant odor;
The gods, like flies, gathered over the offering.

"As soon as the mistress of the gods arrived,
She held up the great necklace that Anu made for her adornment:
'Ye gods, as I shall not forget the ornament of my neck,

So these days shall I remember and not forget forever.
Let the gods come to the altar,
But let Bel not come to the altar,
Because without consultation he caused a flood,
And my people he devoted to destruction.'

"As soon as Bel arrived
And saw the ship, Bel was angry;
He was filled with wrath at the gods, the Igigi:
'Hath there any soul escaped?
Not a man should have survived destruction.'
Ninib openeth his mouth and speaketh,
Saith to the warrior Bel,
'Who but Ea deviseth aught;
Ea also knoweth every art.'
Ea openeth his mouth and speaketh,
Saith to the warrior Bel:
'Thou counsellor of the gods, warrior,
Why, why, didst thou without consultation cause the flood?
On the sinner lay his sin,
On the offender lay his offence;
Show mercy, lest he be destroyed, have patience, lest . . .
Instead of causing a flood
Let the lion come and decimate men;
Instead of causing a flood
Let the jackal come and decimate men;
Instead of causing a flood
Let a famine occur and the land . . .
Instead of causing a flood
Let Ura come and devastate the land.
I did not reveal the decree of the great gods;
I caused Atrahasis to have a dream, and the decree of the gods he heard.'
When now he had taken a resolution,
Bel boarded the ship.
He seized my hand and brought me forth;

He brought forth my wife and caused her to kneel at my side ;
He turned toward us, took his place between us, blessed us :
'Hitherto Ut-napishtim hath been a man ;
Now Ut-napishtim and his wife shall be like us, the gods,
And Ut-napishtim shall dwell afar at the mouth of the rivers.'
They took me and afar at the mouth of the rivers they caused me to dwell."

INDEXES

I.

Topics Treated.

Analysis: of Gen. xxi.–xxx., 37; of Gen. i.–xi., 68 ff.
Angels: at creation, 109 f.; as "sons of God," 191; at the confusion of tongues, 268.
Anthropomorphisms: absence from P, 30; prevalence in J, 32.
Apostles as witnesses to the authorship of the Pentateuch, 14 f.
Ark, comparative size of, 198.
Article, in Hebrew, 5, 9.

"Book of Jashar," 65.
"Book of the Wars of Yahweh," 65 f.

Chronicles, etc., on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 10 ff.
Chronology of the Pentateuch: comparison of texts and versions, 187, 276; historical value, 20 f., 188 ff., 275 f.
Clean and unclean, 202, 218, 221.
Composite narratives in the Pentateuch, 19 ff., 63 f., 196 ff.
Creation: Genesis and geology, 115 ff.; the two accounts compared, 140.
Critics, schools of, 37 ff.

Day in Gen. i. 1– ii. 3, 100 f.
Deuteronomic Document: its discovery, 9, 40, 45, 49; relation to Deuteronomy, 45; characteristics, 23, 34; recognition by de Wette, 24; age, 39 ff., 63; composition, 45 ff.; relation to J and E, 51.
Deuteronomy, on its own authorship, 6 ff., 41 ff.
Diet of primeval man, 112, 156, 221.
Documentary Hypothesis: origin and history, 25 f.; statement, 28 ff.; prevalence, 28, 36; result of its acceptance, 66 f.
Duplicate narratives in the Pentateuch, 17 ff.

Elohistic Document: discovery, 26, 28; characteristics, 32 f.; relation to J, 32, 52 f.; age, 51 ff., 63; relation to D, 52 f.; composition, 64 ff.
Ezekiel and the Priests' Code, 60 f.
Ezra: restorer of the Hebrew Scriptures, 14; relation to the Pentateuch, 61 ff.

Fall, story of, its value, 159.
False prophets, 44.
Flood: duration, 216; value of the story, 225 f.; Babylonian account of, 225 f., 281 ff.
Fragmentary Hypothesis, 21 f.

God (*'Elohim*) in the Pentateuch, 17, 22, 29, 33, 96.

Hexateuch, use of the term, 3, 54.

Image of God, 110 f., 177.

Images: forbidden in Deuteronomy, 9 f., 47; tolerated in earlier documents, 54 f.
Inspiration, limitations of, 16.

Jeremiah: familiarity with D, 39; relation to P, 60.
Jesus and the Pentateuch, 14 f., 15 f.
Joshua, relation of, to the Pentateuch, 3, 54.

Light, Hebrew conception of, 98 f., 104 ff.

Moses: the growth of the tradition ascribing to him the authorship of the Pentateuch, 4 ff.; the earliest testimony concerning him, 10; his place in Hebrew history, 66 f.

Patriarchs, longevity of, 188 ff.
Pentateuch: names, 1 f., 4, 14 f.; divisions, 2 f.; warrant for the name, 3; traditional authorship, 4 ff.; structure and composition, 16 ff.; age, 36 ff.
Priestly Document: characteristics, 17 ff., 29 ff.; age, 58 ff., 63.
Proper names, transliteration of, iv f.
Prophet: the title, 41; his work, 43 f.; types, 43 f.
Prophets: the former, 1, 8 ff.; the later, 10.

Rainfall in Palestine, 206.

Second person in Deuteronomy, 46 ff.
"Sons of God," value of the story of, 195 f.
Supplementary Hypothesis: origin, 23 f.; overthrow, 27 f.

Table of nations, value of, 264 f.
Talmud on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 12 f.
Titles of the Priestly Document, 119, 177, 196, 234, 271.
Tradition, value of, 17.
Translation of Gen. i.–xi., 73 ff.

Worship, centralization of, in Deuteronomy, 10, 40, 44 f., 48 f.

Yahweh in the Pentateuch, 17, 22, 29, 53, 120, 160, 176.
Yahwistic Document: characteristics, 17 ff., 31 f., 53; relation to E, 32, 52; extracts in Gen. xxi.–xxx., 37; age, 51 ff., 63; relation to D, 52 f.; composition, 64 ff.

II.

Books and Authors Cited.

[Figures in parentheses indicate the number of times an author is referred to on a particular page.]

Aben Ezra, *Com.*, 96.
Adam and Eve, Book of, 191.
Allen and Sachtleben, *Across Asia on a Bicycle*, 211.
Arabic Version, 82, 146, 178.
Astruc, Jean, *Conjectures sur la Genèse*, 25, 27.
Augustine, *De Genesi ad Litteram*, 17, 100.
Baba Bathra; see *Talmud*.
Bacon, B. W., *Genesis of Genesis*, v, 29, 33, 37, 53, 126, 155, 160, 257, 260; *JBL*, 53; *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, 6, 29, 33, 45, 53, 65.
Baethgen, Fried., *Beiträge zur sem. Religionsgeschichte*, 170, 171, 172.
Ball, C. J., *Gen.*, 103 (2), 104, 112, 114, 146, 152 (2), 157, 161, 163, 165 (3),

170 (2), 171, 177, 185, 192 (2), 196, 199, 213 (2), 214, 218, 221, 222, 228 (2), 251, 268 (2), 279; *Light from the East*, 98 (2), 99, 102, 107, 109, 113, 121, 123, 133, 158, 238, 245 (2), 246 (2), 252.

Baudissin, W. W., *Studien zur sem. Religionsgeschichte*, 96, 98, 106, 120.

Behrman, Georg, *Dan.*, 10.

Benziger, J., *Heb. Archaeologie*, 171, 172, 198.

Bereshith Rabba, 110, 111, 138, 143, 167, 270.

Berosus; see Cory.

Berry, G. R., *Am. Jour. of Sem. Languages, etc.*, 192.

Bevan, A. A., *Dan.*, 10.

Bleek, Fried., *Aph. Beiträge*, 54; *Einl. in das A. T.*, Eng., 3 (2), 23.

Bochart, Sam., *Geographia Sacra*, 130, 237, 238, 258.

Boscawen, W. St. C., *The Bible and the Monuments*, 2, 106, 118, 159, 168, 225.

Böttcher, Fried., *Lehrbuch*, 120, 181, 217; *Aehrenlese*, 165.

Briggs, C. A., *Higher Crit. of the Hex.*, 15, 17; *Mes. Prophecies*, 231.

Brown, Francis, *Lex.*, 114, 123, 139.

Brugsch, Hein., *Persische Reise*, 128, 130.

Bruston, Ch., *Les deux Jéhoviste*, 35.

Budde, Karl, *Bib. Urgeschichte*, 35, 121, 126 (2), 135, 147, 155, 160, 164, 169 (3), 172, 173, 174, 175 (2), 181, 182, 184, 185, 188, 191, 192, 193, 194, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 228, 230 (2), 231, 232 (2), 247, 257, 271, 273, 274; *Richt. u. Sam.*, 3, 43, 54.

Calvin, John, *Com.*, 128, 130.

Cheyne, T. K., *Enc. Bib.*, 158, 168, 169, 170 (2), 171, 258; *Isa.*, 250; *ZAW*, 198.

Clarke, Adam, *Com.*, 167.

Colenso, J. W., *The Pent. and the Book of Jos.*, 24, 39.

Conder, C. R., *The Bible and the East*, 238.

Cornill, C. H., *Einl. in das A. T.*, 3, 37, 45, 49, 53, 54, 57, 61, 65, 175.

Cory, I. P., *Ancient Fragments*, 102, 108, 113, 189, 211, 217.

Crawford, T. P., *The Patriarchal Dynasties*, 179.

Dana, J. D., *Manual*, 115; *Textbook*, 116.

Davidson, A. B., *Eze.*, 262.

Dawson, J. W., *Eden Lost and Found*, 115, 188, 206.

Delitzsch, Franz, *Com.*, v, 97, 101, 102, 109, 110, 119, 125, 138, 142, 146 (2), 147, 150, 153, 163, 176, 179, 181, 183, 192, 193, 194, 207, 208, 221, 229, 231, 242, 257, 266, 270, 272, 278.

Delitzsch, Fried., *Gesch. Babyloniens u. Assyriens*, 131, 245; *Hebrew and Assyrian*, 104, 139; *Wo lag das Paradies*, 120, 123, 124, 128 (2), 129, 130 (3), 131, 132 (2), 133 (3), 158, 168, 235, 236, 244 (2), 246 (2), 247, 248, 249, 259, 260, 274.

Dict. of the Bible (Hastings), 130, 131 (2), 133, 158, 161, 168, 172, 210, 211, 235, 237, 243 (2), 244, 251 (2), 253, 262 (2), 263.

Dillmann, Aug., *Gen.*, v, 29, 37, 109, 110, 120, 124, 128, 130, 132, 135, 138, 139, 140, 146, 147 (2), 150, 160, 164, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 176, 181, 185, 192 (2), 193, 194, 199, 202, 209, 212 (2), 216, 218, 224, 229, 231, 234, 237, 249, 255, 264, 272; *Num. Deu. u. Jos.*, 35, 36, 38 (2), 42, 48, 49, 52 (2), 58.

Driver, S. R., *Deu.*, 39, 41, 42, 43, 46 (2), 47, 48, 253; *Int. to the Lit. of the O. T.*, 3, 29, 30, 33, 34, 43, 45, 51, 52, 65; *Heb. Text of Sam.*, 152; *Tenses*, 120; *Studia Biblica*, 120.

Ebers, Georg, *Aegypten u. die Bücher Moses*, 241 (3), 250 (3), 251 (3).

Eichhorn, J. G., *Einl. in das A. T.*, 27.
Encyclopædia Biblica, 100, 130 (2), 158, 161, 168, 169, 170 (2), 171, 185, 189, 225, 226, 230, 241, 244, 246, 252, 258, 259.
English Version, 4, 8, 102, 103, 107, 114, 115, 120 (2), 138.
Enoch, Book of, 183, 191.
Erman, A., *ZAW*, 251 (2).
Eusebius Pamphili, *Prep. Evangelica*, 271.
Ewald, Hein., *Gesch. Israels*, 27 (2); *Heb. Sprache*, 108.

French, R. V.; see *Lex Mosaica.*
Fürst, Jul., *Kanon des A. T.*, 2 (2); *Lex.*, 151 (2).

Geddes, Alex., *Bible*, 21 (2), 54.
Gesenius, Wil., *Gesch. der heb. Sprache*, 39; *Gram.*, 5, 96 (2), 97, 103, 104, 108 (2), 113, 114, 115, 122, 129, 138, 139, 140, 144 (2), 145, 152, 162 (2), 164, 166, 171, 173, 174, 177, 199, 206, 207, 212, 228 (2), 229, 230.
Ginsburg, David, *Bib. Hebraica*, 192.
Glaser, Ed., *Skizze der Gesch. Arabiens*, 129, 130, 241, 242 (4), 243 (2), 244, 260 (3), 262 (7), 263 (2), 264, 274 (2).
Graf, K. H., *Die geschichtl. Bücher des A. T.*, 37.
Greek Version, 59, 73 (3), 74 (4), 75 (5), 77 (6), 78, 79 (3), 80, 81, 82, 83, 84 (2), 85 (5), 86 (2), 87, 88 (3), 89 (2), 91 (3), 92, 101, 103 (2), 104 (2), 105, 107, 112 (3), 113, 119, 120, 121, 131, 136 (2), 137, 138, 139 (2), 143, 144, 146, 150, 151, 152 (2), 153, 156, 157, 160, 161, 164, 170, 171 (2), 172, 175, 176 (2), 186, 187, 189, 194, 197, 200, 202 (2), 204, 205 (2), 206, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214, 215, 218, 220, 223, 228, 235, 236, 237, 239, 241 (3), 246, 250, 253, 257, 260 (2), 261, 262, 268, 269, 271, 272 (2), 273 (2), 274, 275 (3), 276, 279, 280.
Green, W. H., *Hebraica*, 36; *Heb. Feasts*, 36; *Higher Crit. of the Pent.*, 4, 5, 7, 16, 29, 36, 41; *Moses and the Prophets*, 36, 60, 61; *Unity of Genesis*, 36.
Gunkel, Hermann, *Gen.*, v, 111, 135, 146, 152, 161, 205, 268, 269, 272; *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 99 (2), 106, 108, 113, 118.
Guyot, Arnold, *Creation*, 99, 107 (2), 115.

Halévy, J., *Jour. Asiatique*, 242, 263.
Harman, H. M., *Intr. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures*, 4, 7, 16.
Harper, W. R., *Hebraica*, 36.
Hartmann, A. T., *Hist.-krit. Forschungen*, 22.
Haupt, Paul, *Am. Or. Soc.*, 122; *Sacred Books of the O. T.*, 29, 161.
Hensler, C. G., *Bemerkungen üb. Pss. u. Gen.*, 178.
Herder, J. G., *Spirit of Heb. Poetry*, 173.
Hobbes, Thos., *Leviathan*, 6.
Holzinger, H., *Einl. in den Hex.*, 3, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 45 (2), 61, 63, 121; *Gen.*, v, 69 (2), 119, 148, 150, 154, 157, 169, 173, 181, 186, 209, 213, 216, 219, 223, 228, 235, 240, 249, 256, 271.
Hommel, Fritz, *Ancient Heb. Tradition*, 129, 188, 245; *Dic. of the Bible*, 131 (2).
Hupfeld, Herm., *Die Quellen der Gen.*, 27.

Ilgen, C. D., *Die Urkunden des jerus. Tempelarchivs*, 26 (2), 27, 119, 192.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 98, 102, 105, 107, 113, 183, 191, 225, 226, 244 (2), 248, 267 (2).
Jensen, P., *Hittiter u. Armenier*, 275; *Kosmologie*, 98, 102 (2), 103, 122, 133.
Johns, C. W. H., *The Expositor*, 198.

Josephus, Fl., *Antiquities of the Jews*, 13, 128, 130, 191, 237, 238 (2), 258; *Cont. Apion*, 13.
Jubilees, Book of, 110, 134, 141, 143, 191, 237.

Kautzsch, Emil, *The Lit. of the O. T.*, 69.
Keil, C. F., *Einl. in das A. T.*, 4, 7, 41, 42, 43; *Gen.*, 128, 162, 224, 245.
Kelle, K. G., *Vorurtheilsfreie Würdigung der mos. Schriften*, 23.
Kittel, Rud., *History of the Hebrews*, 3, 36, 38, 42, 52 (2), 58, 65, 279; *Kön.*, 263.
Klostermann, A., *Sam. u. Kön.*, 54; *Pentateuch*, 28.
Knobel, A., *Gen.*, 112, 115, 250.
König, Ed., *System der heb. Syntax*, 143.
Kosters, W. H., *Herstel van Israel in het pers. Tijdvak*, 63.
Kuenen, Abram, *Origin and Composition of the Hex.*, 34, 35, 37, 38, 46, 47, 49, 55, 61 (2); *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 192.

de Lagarde, Paul, *Onom. Sacra*, 198; *Orientalia*, 170.
Le Conte, Jos., *Elements of Geology*, 189.
Lenormant, Franç., *Beginnings of History*, 111, 135, 138, 158 (2), 170 (3), 173, 175, 181, 182, 211, 216.
Lex Mosaica, 16, 36, 60, 61.
Luther, Martin, *Gen.*, 151; *Version*, 161.

Maspero, G. C. C., *Receuil de Travaux*, 238 (2).
McCurdy, J. F., *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, 131, 133, 232, 246 (2), 247 (2), 248, 252, 253, 259, 279 (2).
Ménant, Joach., *Annales des Rois d'Assyrie*, 249.
Meyer, Ed., *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 131, 234 (3), 235 (4), 236 (2), 237, 239 (3), 241, 247, 250, 251, 257 (2), 258, 259, 261, 266, 279.
Mitchell, H. G., *Am.*, 205, 246; *JBL*, 46, 47, 48.
Moore, G. F., *JBL.*, 64; *Jud.*, 3, 42, 55, 193, 253.
Movers, F. C., *Die Phönicier*, 238.
Murphy, J. G., *Gen.*, 99 (2), 105, 109, 137, 144, 179, 188, 190, 191, 209, 224.

Nestle, E., *Marginalien u. Materialien*, 152, 222.
Nöldeke, Theodor, *Unterss. zur Kritik des A. T.*, 185.
Nowack, W., *Klein. Propheten*, 61.

Olshausen, J., *Beiträge zur Kritik des überlieferten Textes im Buche Gen.*, 138, 214.
Onkelos, *Targum*, 86, 161, 211, 238.
Origen, *Cont. Celsum*, 15.
Ovid, *Met.*, 112.
Oxford *Hexateuch* (Carpenter, Harford-Battersby, and others), v, 29, 30, 32, 33 (2), 34, 35, 39, 45, 51 (2), 52, 57, 61, 63, 64, 175.

Peiser, Felix, *Zeitsch. für Assyriologie*, 131.
Petrie, W. M. F., *Hist. of Egypt*, 244, 254 (2).
Philo Judæus, *Works* (Bohn), 13, 110, 191.
Piepenbring, Ch., *Theology of the O. T.*, 120, 135, 137.
Pliny, *Hist. Naturalis*, 130.
Pressel, W., *Stimmen der Völker*, 128, 130.
Ptolemy, *Geographia*, 242.

Ragozin, Z. A., *Assyria*, 123, 234, 235 (2), 236, 245, 257; *Chaldea*, 257, 265, 266, 267; *Media, etc.*, 258.
Rashi, *Com.*, 96, 160, 191.
Rask, R. C., Ilgen's *Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie*, 178.
von Raumer, Karl, *Palästina*, 128.

Rawlinson, George, *Ancient Egypt*, 237.
Reuss, Ed., 37; *Das A. T.*, 141, 161; *Gesch. des A. T.*, 49.
Rice, W. N.; see Dana.
Riehm, Ed., *Einl. in das A. T.*, 41; *Handwörterbuch des bib. Altertums*, 172, 198.
Rogers, R. W., *Hist. of Babylonia and Assyria*, 234, 235, 236 (2), 245, 246, 247, 249, 257 (2), 266, 267, 279 (2).
Rosenmüller, E. F. K., *Handbuch der bib. Alterthumskunde*, 130.
Ryle, E. F., *Early Narratives of Gen.*, 118, 159.

Samaritan Pentateuch, 75 (2), 76, 77 (2), 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85 (4), 86 (4), 88 (3), 89 (2), 91 (2), 105, 108, 112 (2), 121, 128, 129 (2), 136, 137, 138, 139 (2), 144, 146, 151, 152 (2), 155, 161, 163, 165, 175, 176, 181, 182, 183 (2), 184, 186, 187, 196, 200 (2), 202 (2), 203, 204, 205 (2), 206, 207, 210, 213, 217, 220, 223, 233, 236 (2), 239, 244, 256 (2), 259, 260, 261, 262 (3), 269, 271, 272, 273, 274 (2), 275 (2), 276, 278 (2), 279, 280 (3).
Sayce, A. H., *Hibbert Lectures*, 168, 169, 170; *Races of the O. T.*, 234.
Schrader, Eberh., *Einl. in das A. T.*, 54; *Keilinschriften u. das A. T.*, 98, 118, 120, 124, 158, 159, 162, 210, 211, 225 (Eng.), 237, 243, 246, 247, 248 (2), 254 (3), 258, 277, 279; *Keilinschriftl. Bibliothek*, 98 (2), 99, 102, 107, 109, 113, 121, 123, 129, 133, 183, 191, 198, 199, 206, 207, 211, 212, 213, 216, 218, 220, 224, 234 (2), 235 (2), 236, 237, 238 (9), 243, 244, 245 (4), 246 (5), 247, 248 (5), 249, 253, 254 (3), 258, 259, 260 (2), 262, 267, 270 (3), 274, 279, 281.
Schultz, Herm., *Alttestamentl. Theologie*, 141.
Siegfried u. Stade, *Lex.*, 228.
Smith, George, *Assyrian Discoveries*, 246; *The Athenæum*, 270.
Smith, G. A., *Histor. Geography of the Holy Land*, 255.
Smith, W. R., *The O. T. in the Jewish Church*, 49, 60, 61, 65, 66; *Religion of the Semites*, 222 (2).
Spinoza, Benedict, *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, 21 (2).
Spurrell, G. J., *Gen.*, 145.
Stade, Bernh., *De Populo Javan*, 250; *ZAW*, 69, 168, 175.
Stähelin, J. J., *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 54; *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 54.
Steuernagel, Carl, *Deu. u. Jos.*, 50 (2), 175, 176.
Strack, H. L., *Gen.*, 112, 114, 119, 150, 163, 165, 197.
Syriac Version, 73, 75 (2), 77 (3), 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85 (3), 86 (2), 88 (2), 89 (2), 92, 94, 101, 111, 112, 139, 143, 144, 149, 151, 152, 165, 175, 178, 197, 200, 202 (2), 204, 206, 209, 211, 213, 218.

Talmud, 12, 133.
Targum to Ezekiel, 238.
Tatian, *Diatessaron*, 63.
Tertullian, *Adv. Hermogenem*, 17; *Adv. Marcionem*, 191.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 191.
Thoms, W. J., *Human Longevity*, 188.
Thomson, W. M., *The Land and the Book*, 255 (2).
Tiele, C. P., *Babylonisch-assyrische Geschichte*, 246.
Torrey, C. C., *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 63.
Tosaphoth, 133.
Toy, C. H., *Eze.*, 250; *JBL.*, 118.
Tristram, H. B., *Land of Israel*, 255; *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, 198.
Tuch, Fried., *Gen.*, 25, 120, 163, 193.

Umbreit, F. W. C., *Stud. u. Krit.*, 161.

Valeton, J. J. P., *ZAW*, 200.
Vater, J. S., *Com.*, 22.
Vergil, *Georgica*, 112.
Vulgate, 31, 75, 77 (2), 81, 86, 129, 136, 139, 151, 205, 213, 241.

Weber, Ferd., *Palästinische Theologie*, 147.
Wellhausen, Jul., *Comp. des Hex.*, 37 (2), 43, 45, 53, 192, 231, 244, 256 (2); *Israelit. u. jüd. Gesch.*, 62; *Gesch. Israels*, 43, 60, 61, 126, 277; *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, 10.
Westphal, Alex., *Sources du Pentateuque*, 46.
de Wette, W. M. L., *Dis. critico-exegetica*, 24; *Einl. in das A. T.*, 54.
Wildeboer, G., *Letterkunde des ouden Verbonds*, 3.
Winckler, Hugo, *Mittheilungen der vorderas. Gesellschaft*, 238 (2), 241.

Zeydner, H., *ZAW*, 161.
Zunz, L., *ZDMG*, 39.

III.

Isolated Passages Explained.

Gen. xxxvi. 2 253
Ex. xvii. 14 5
xxi. 13 51
xxxiv. 28 . . . . . 5 f.
Num. xiii. 33 194
Jos. xi. 3 253
Jud. iii. 3 253
viii. 27 55
1 Sam. ii. 22 59
x. 25 9
2 Sam. xvii. 3 152
1 Kgs. viii. 4 . . . . . 59 f.
1 Kgs. viii. 53 54
x. 22 263
Isa. ix. 15/14 44
xlvi. 10 96
lxvi. 19 250
Jer. vii. 22 60
xxv. 20 f. 260
xlvi. 9 250
Eze. xxvii. 10 250
xxx. 5 250
Cant. vii. 11/10 . . . . . 152 f

IV

Hebrew Words Discussed

אַבְרָם 277
אֵד 122
אָדָם 123
אֱלֹהִים 96, 120
אֱנוֹשׁ 176
אַרְפַּכְשַׁד 258
אִשָּׁה 139
בֹּאֲכָה 254, 256
בָּבֵל 269
בְּעֵבֶר 42
בְּרֵאשִׁית 96
בִּשְׁגָּם 192
הֶבֶל 162
הֵיטִיב 164
חֶלְבֵהֶן 163
חֲנוֹךְ 169
יָבָל 171
יָדוֹן 192
יְהוָֹה 120
יוּבָל 171
יָלַד 244, 260
יֶלֶד 174
יֶפֶת 230, 232
יֶרֶד 181
כֹּל 144
כָּלָה (I) 114
כְּנַעַן 230
לֹטֵשׁ 172
לֶמֶךְ ..... 169 *f.*
מְחוּיָאֵל ..... 169 *f.*
מְתוּשָׁאֵל ..... 169 *f.*
מְתוּשֶׁלַח 184
נֹחַ 185
נַעֲמָה 172
עִבְרִי 261
עָדָה 169
עִירָד 169
עֲנָמִים 250
צִלָּה 170
צֶלַע 138
קִדְמַת 132
קוּם (III) 224
קַיִן 162
קֵינָן 181
קֵץ 210
שׁוּף ..... 150 *f.*
שָׁחַת 197
שֵׁת 176
תּוּבָל 172
תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ ..... 152 *f.*

The Riverside Press
Electrotyped and printed by H. O. Houghton & Co.
Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

Boston Public Library
3 9999 10503 078 5